

THE  
LECTURES  
DELIVERED BEFORE THE  
AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF INSTRUCTION,  
AT BOSTON, MASS., AUGUST, 1867;  
INCLUDING  
THE JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS,  
AND  
A LIST OF THE OFFICERS.

PUBLISHED UNDER THE DIRECTION OF THE BOARD OF CENSORS.

COPY

BOSTON:

COMMITTEE OF PUBLICATION.

1868.

LZ 13

A 51

1867

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1867, by  
JOHN KNEELAND, *President American Institute of Instruction*,  
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the District of Massachusetts.

STATE OF OHIO

S. CHISM, — Franklin Printing House, 24 Washington Street, Boston.



# CONTENTS.

## JOURNAL OF PROCEEDINGS.

	PAGE.
ADDRESS OF WELCOME BY DR. J. A. LAMSON . . . . .	5
RESPONSE OF PRESIDENT SHELDON . . . . .	7
ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT . . . . .	9
DISCUSSION: "School Discipline: Its Objects and Methods" . . . . .	10, 49, 70
DISCUSSION: "The Place Natural History Should Occupy in a Course of Instruction" . . . . .	30
THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION . . . . .	40
READING: STYLES AND METHODS . . . . .	69
DISCUSSION: "Right-Mindedness Favorable to Intellectual Growth," . . . . .	85
LIST OF OFFICERS . . . . .	96
DISCUSSION: "The Proportion in Which Knowledge and Discipline Should be Made the Ends of Education . . . . .	98
CLOSING EXERCISES . . . . .	106
PRESIDENT KNEELAND'S ADDRESS . . . . .	111

## LECTURES.

I.—SCHOOL DISCIPLINE: ITS OBJECTS AND METHODS. By <i>Hosea H. Lincoln</i> . . . . .	113
II.—HINTS TOWARDS A PROFESSION OF TEACHING. By <i>G. O. Thompson</i> . . . . .	131
III.—THE PLACE OF NATURAL HISTORY IN A COURSE OF INSTRUCTION. By <i>Isaac F. Cady</i> . . . . .	176
IV.—READING: STYLES AND METHODS. By <i>Z. Richards</i> . . . . .	196
V.—THE FOUNDERS OF THE INSTITUTE, AND ITS FIRST PRESI- DENT. By <i>Elbridge Smith</i> . . . . .	213
VI.—RIGHT-MINDEDNESS FAVORABLE TO INTELLECTUAL GROWTH. By <i>A. A. Miner, D. D.</i> . . . . .	319
VII.—TRUANCY: THE EVIL AND REMEDY. By <i>Rev. B. G. Northrop</i> . . . . .	331
VIII.—THE PROPORTION IN WHICH KNOWLEDGE AND DIS- CIPLINE SHOULD BE MADE THE ENDS OF EDUCATION. By <i>Thomas Hill, D. D.</i> . . . . .	346



# AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF INSTRUCTION.

THIRTY-EIGHTH ANNUAL MEETING.

---

## FIRST DAY'S PROCEEDINGS.

BOSTON, MASS., *July 31, 1867.*

The AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF INSTRUCTION commenced the First Session of its Thirty-eighth Annual Meeting, in Tremont Temple, Boston, at half-past two o'clock this afternoon. The Association was called to order by the President, William E. Sheldon, Esq.; and prayer was offered by Rev. L. H. Rockwood, of the American Tract Society.

### ADDRESS OF WELCOME BY DR. J. A. LAMPSON.

*Dr. John A. Lampson*, a member of the Boston School-Committee, welcomed the Institute to the City of Boston. He said,—

Mr. President, Ladies, and Gentlemen of the American Institute of Instruction,—In behalf of the School-Committee of Boston, it is my privilege and my pleasure to extend to you a most cordial and hearty welcome to this city. We appreciate the magnitude of your mission, the indispensability and dignity of your vocation. Wedded to our schools, in which we take an honest pride, but still constantly seeking new light, and striving for new and improved methods of training; recognizing the power of association to accu-

multate energy, to kindle the heart and create new warmth and greater earnestness in our work,—when the best educators of the land, from city and country, all moved by one and the same inspiration, come to our metropolis and assemble in this hall, the first words that *must* leap to our lips are the words of welcome, warm and strong. Judge Russell, the other day, told a story of his visit to a city on the Mississippi in the night, and, though the occasion was a festive one, he found it wrapped in darkness, the gas unlighted. The fact was, the people, weighed down by a large debt, had thought it best to dismiss their teachers and stop their schools, and thus lift the burden; but, when the matter was in debate, a Yankee, who had there erected his domestic altar, thought it better that the feet should stumble in darkness, rather than the minds of his children be shrouded in the black mantles of ignorance, proposed *not* to cut off the schools, but to cut off the gas. *That* man was the true representative of the New-England idea,—*education first of all things; comforts, luxuries, and elegancies, afterwards*,—the true inheritor of the idea of our fathers, who, before comfortable shelters covered their heads, planted the foundation of their schools in the interest of sound learning. The subjects which are to engage your deliberations on this occasion are of transcendent importance. Were you a body of statesmen convened to consider some matter of state, the lightning would take your words as they dropped from your lips to every house in the land; but, while *they* would be shaping the superstructure, *yours* is the more important business of laying the *foundation*. While they attended to outward interests, yours is the holier function of quickening the soul. To do this well, you must penetrate human nature to its core; the laws regulating the intellectual and moral machinery must be as familiar as the alphabet; you must

know how to touch all the secret springs of human action ; how to place before the mind the inspiring motive, so that every faculty shall be brought into vigorous action, producing a harmonious and complete development, culminating in men and women of full stature, with not only the learning of the schools in their heads, but with *that* truth and rectitude in their hearts which shall make them bold and ready for the performance of every duty, I will not trespass upon your time, further than to express the hope that the result of this meeting may be the accomplishment of all you seek ; and when you separate, may you carry to your homes, not only pleasant recollections of your visit, and the warm wishes of your friends here, but also *living coals* of sacred fire in your hearts for the noble work in which you are engaged.

## RESPONSE OF PRESIDENT SHELDON.

The President responded as follows :—

Sir,— The cordial welcome which you have been so kind as to extend to this Institute, from the School-Committee of the City of Boston, commands our sincere gratitude. We were well aware that any thing which appertains to culture and civilization, throughout the length and breadth of the land, would always find a hearty sympathy in the City of Boston.

Your allusion to the anecdote, given by Judge Russell, reminds me of a recent excursion which I made beyond the Mississippi. I happened to fall in company with an intelligent Western lady, who inquired where I was from. With a pride somewhat magnified, I answered, "From Boston."—"Sir," said she, "I thought so." Then she related a story of General Sherman meeting in Washington a gentleman to whom he said, "I think, sir, I have had the pleasure of

seeing you before, in San Francisco?"—"No," said the gentleman; "I was never farther from home than I am now. I was born in Boston, educated in Boston, have preached in Boston, and being a Baptist, I was immersed in Boston."—"Yes, sir," said the General, stretching himself up; "and when you die, I suppose you expect to go to Boston?"

We expected to find here an interest in every thing that opens the mind and heart of the people, and in every thing that relates to the promotion of intellectual and moral culture.

Thirty-seven years ago, this Institute had its birth in this city: its very spirit is written upon the educational history of the intervening period. The lectures and volumes of its proceedings have gone forth, aiding, stimulating, and encouraging, more perhaps than any other single association, the promotion of universal culture throughout the whole country.

We thank you for the recognition you have given us from the School-Board of Boston,—a board, who, from my personal knowledge, I can affirm are gratuitous laborers in this cause, sustaining the responsibilities and cares of their position and executing the trust committed to them with an intelligence and fidelity which has placed the schools of Boston in such a position as to call for the admiration of the country at large. You have participated largely in this work; and for this, this Institute and all educators owe to you their thanks.

Thanking you again for this cordial welcome, we have to express the hope that the result of the deliberations of this meeting may prove satisfactory to the citizens of Boston, and for the best interest of education throughout the country.

## ADDRESS TO THE INSTITUTE, BY THE PRESIDENT.

Ladies and Gentlemen,—It was my fortune to be placed in the position of the presiding officer of this body one year ago, and on that occasion I tendered my thanks for the honor conferred upon me, misplaced as it was. I have now only to say that I am still grateful for the honor extended; and although now a layman, I shall endeavor to conduct this meeting as well as I may, until you see fit to choose a successor.

Having withdrawn my special relations to this cause of education, I shall await the choice of a successor by you, assuming the duties of this position no longer than is necessary to enable you to do so.

The programme is one in which we are all interested, and we hope that every friend of education will feel that he has a right, and that it may be his duty, to participate in the discussions. And I hope educators will speak out frankly and honestly upon the themes which are to come before us. It is sometimes said that teachers do not say what they really believe, Now I call on you to say your say honestly and truly. It is by agitating these great questions that teachers, with citizens and the public at large, get at precisely what we are after; and that is, truth in method, truth in theory, and truth in application. We invite you—of course observing all the courtesy of parliamentary usage in debate—to the freest and fullest discussion.

*Rev. Mr. Stebbins*, of Springfield, moved that the President appoint a committee of nine to nominate officers for the ensuing year; and it was agreed to.



*Mr. Wheelock*, of Boston, moved that a committee of three be appointed by the President, on teachers and teachers' places; and it was agreed to.

The subject of the amendment of the Constitution was then taken up, and the committee to whom the matter was referred were instructed to report to-morrow morning; and it was agreed that the vote upon the proposed amendment should be taken at that time. Messrs. Stone, of Maine, Bulkley, of N Y., and Hagar, of Mass.; were appointed the committee to arrange the form of presenting the amendment for the action of the Institute.

#### DISCUSSION.

The subject assigned for discussion at this hour was then taken up; viz., "*School Discipline: Its Objects and Methods.*"

*Hosea H. Lincoln, Esq.*, Master of the Lyman School, Boston, commenced the discussion by reading an admirable essay, which will be found in another place.

*Dr. John P. Ordway*, a member of the Boston School-Committee, was next called upon, who said, —

Mr. President, and Ladies and Gentlemen, — When you, Mr. President, informed me, a few days ago, that there was to be a discussion of this subject, I understood you to say that the time to be occupied by each speaker would be about ten minutes. Of course you are all aware that no one could give a proper idea of his views in ten minutes, or a half-hour. The gentleman who has just sat down remarked that he had not time to say all that the importance of the subject demands.



The gentleman has well said that the object of the teacher should be to teach the children under his charge, the love of knowledge. But there his whole address has failed, according to my views of the truth of the matter. He may well say that there is a want of education upon this subject. There are parents who not only feel, but know, that the discipline in our schools is not what it should be—kind and parental.

Children are sent to school to learn to love their teachers and to learn to love the instruction which they receive. I have watched the gentleman's remarks as closely as I could, and my view with regard to the matter is this, that in time corporal punishment will be abolished. Granting, for the sake of the argument, that there are cases where it would be considered necessary, the abuse of it, particularly in this city, has been great for the past few years, and—I say it with all due respect to the teachers, for there is as wide a difference between them as there is between heaven and earth—shows that some of them have not the law of love and kindness in their hearts. I know many teachers who are not fit for their vocation in this respect. The same argument used by the gentleman was used in regard to our schools.

In the Bowditch School for girls, where there are a thousand pupils, there has not been a case of corporal punishment for the last year. In previous years there was an average of from four to six hundred cases. Why was this? The former master believed in corporal punishment. Out of no disrespect to him, I say he believed in it. He had the same argument that many do, that Solomon recommended it, or that his rule was, "Spare the rod and spoil the child," forgetting that if we followed all of Solomon's recommendations we should go backward. There are many things in the Bible which would be absurd as matters of discipline in our schools.

My own experience, as a member of the School-Board for the last six years, has been to convince me that three fourths of the teachers in the public schools are not fit for their vocation. That is an unpopular thing to say in such an audience; but I believe it. Let any one go and stand in the entry of the school-room, when the teacher does not know it, and listen to the style of conversation going on in the school-room, the teacher sitting as if he were a statue, and the pupils were bricks and mortar, instead of human beings. Then look at the reverse. There are teachers who do not whip at all; they draw the attention of the scholars with love of the school. I have heard men, who are in good standing in our city, as merchants, speak with the utmost contempt of the teachers under whom they were formerly taught. What was the reason? The teacher never gave them a chance to give him their affections.

I desire to read a letter which I received from Mr. Shippen, of Philadelphia, on this matter.

“PHILADELPHIA, *February 9, 1867.*

“Dr. ORDWAY. — Dear Sir: I duly received your late letter, and have been so much occupied with the teachers' salary contest here, that until now I have been unable to respond.

“Since my former letter to you on the subject of corporal punishment in schools, I have thought much upon the matter, and have made many inquiries of teachers and others, with the view of correcting any errors in facts or opinion, if I had been so at fault. The result is, that I am more than ever satisfied with the views I expressed to you. The school is no place for the rod; it belongs to the parent alone. I know custom has sanctioned it since the time “whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary.” It becomes simply a question whether such punishment benefits a child in reality; whether, after the rod's use, the child is a better child; whether the birch has instilled into the recipient any desire to do better in the future; or whether it has caused repentance for

error. If the rod could produce these results, then what an efficient instrument it would be in the Sunday school, in churches, in prisons, with old and young; then it were better than sermons, lessons, essays, and tracts. But does it benefit a school? Does it benefit discipline? If it ever does so, which I greatly question, it is through *fear*, and fear alone. Is corporal punishment a *necessary* evil? I know how hard it is to eradicate long-established customs, and how equally difficult to do away with notions founded upon mere custom. My own experience in the public schools of this city, as an active director and controller, teaches me that he who cannot maintain efficient discipline in his school by winning the love, respect, and esteem of his pupils, is not entirely fitted for all his professional duties: he should give place to those who can govern without the rod. Teachers here have predicted all the evils which the mind may conceive of, as consequent upon the abandonment of the free and frequent use of the rule of birch. Now, after bending their efforts for discipline in other ways, they could not be induced to resort to the old punishment. This, I believe, will be the testimony of the great mass of teachers in this city.

"In many of our wards, whipping has been long forbidden; in some, simply discontinued; in a few, yet permitted.

"Several years since, I saw a long line of thirty-six boys ranged in military order, each waiting for his turn. To each was meted out *equal* justice; for every one received the same force, weight, power, and accelerated motion, irrespective of the offence. School out, it was resolved, with remarkable unanimity, that "whipping was of no use," and that each would do his utmost to torment the tormentor; and they kept their resolve. I also knew of another class, within a short period, who determined to worry and annoy a new Principal, who, perceiving their intent, was mild, pleasant, genial, and firm. He treated each boy with respect, placed him *upon his honor*; was a gentleman himself, and treated all as if they were. Very shortly, the class, of their own accord, without prompting of others, passed a resolution which, I learn, was signed by each member, and handed to the Principal. It was to the effect that they regretted their past conduct, in future would seek to gain his respect and their own, and would seek no longer to disgrace the institution of which they had been such unworthy members. And

the class keeps its pledge. Compare these cases, and form your own conclusions.

"For years while at school no rod had been lain upon me; at last I received it for an offence of which I was in nowise guilty. I had been whipped; it was enough. It was perfectly indifferent to me afterwards whether the punishment was renewed or not.

"A single misuse of the rod will do lasting injury to a child; a word of kindness may make an impress upon the heart capable of receiving good in tender years, and, like the well-planted and cultivated seed, will, in due time, yield beautiful and bountiful fruits and flowers.

"No longer is it permitted that seamen shall be flogged; we justly revolted at the idea that the rod of the master could fall upon the slave,—and yet we permit that a stranger may hold the instrument of torture over the tender, delicate child, the young and manly boy,—even our own children,—yes, and be it said with regret, even over the softer sex. Whatever the despots of Europe may sanction, how long soever they may use the "whipping gown," and make the child kiss the rod which smites it, I feel happy in the belief that it will not be long before severity will yield to kindness in all the schools of our land. The whole country regards Boston as the school pioneer, and looks to it for its council and experience. How powerful, then, her influence, if her committee-men would declare that the days of severity had passed, and a new era of kindness had dawned. Very truly and respectfully yours,

"EDWARD SHIPPEN."

I could not but think of the manner in which the gentleman (Mr. Lincoln) dwelt on treating children as criminals. I do not know but his experience has prepared him to use language on this subject like that; but I think the establishment of a Botany-Bay Colony would be better for the masters of some of the schools, especially for those who look upon our children as criminals.

*Dr. Cornell*, of Boston, but recently from Philadelphia, explained the plan of the School-Board of Philadelphia.

They have there two boards; what may be called a senate and house of representatives. Dr. Shippen is president of the upper branch, though not a superintendent of schools, for there is none in that city. In some wards of that city, as each ward is independent in that matter, corporal punishment still exists, and in some it is entirely done away with. Each ward has twelve men, who have the management of the schools; while the upper branch, or controllers, have the management of the boys' and girls' high schools; and they appropriate the money and select books. If the teachers of Boston are so utterly incompetent that three fourths of them are unfit for their duties, I think the fault lies with the School-Committee of Boston; and as the good Doctor has been six years on that committee, he ought to have had some influence. (Laughter.)

*Dr. Ordway.* I am in a minority, -and that is the reason. I do not believe in all our School-Board do.

*Dr. Cornell.* I think the School-Board was better ten years ago, when I had the honor to be connected with it, than it is now; and I do not believe that three fourths of the teachers then were utterly incompetent for their position. When we found one such, then, he was turned out.

The manner of electing the School-Boards of Philadelphia became so obnoxious that, at the last session of the legislature, the mode of election was annulled, and the directors and controllers are now to be appointed by the judges of the courts.

One word about that old Solomon; a wicked old fellow he was. I wish to say that Solomon, setting aside inspiration, saw enough in his father's family to convince him that he who spared the rod spoiled the child. (Laughter.) Need

I recount those instances? One son was put to death in cold blood; another attempted to wrest the sceptre from his father's hands; and the good king walked bareheaded and barefooted up the mountain; and, though he lamented bitterly the loss of that son, another son, just before he was required to resign his sceptre, made the attempt to take it again from his dying hands. And now there is one little verse, respecting this last son, which I wish you would always remember, for I think it raises the curtain and shows us the whole difficulty in David's family. That verse runs thus: "His father had never said unto him, Son, why hast thou done so?" So far from using the rod, he had never even so much as said, "Why hast thou done so?" He had not done so much as good old Eli did; and his family was destroyed because he did not restrain his sons. That was the difficulty with him.

I can tell you of a school in Philadelphia where they did not use the rod, and the school was run down; but afterwards they did resort to that wicked old custom, and the school was improved.

*Rev. D. S. King*, a member of the School-Board of Boston, said he did not intend when he came into the hall to make any remarks; but, said he, as a member of the Boston School-Committee, I owe it to the Boston teachers to say that they have been slandered. It is not true that three fourths of our teachers are not fit for their position, and I am truly grateful that the gentleman is in the minority on the Boston School-Committee. (Applause.) I believe the committee is a good one; and, while I accord to the gentleman of the committee who has now complained of the teachers all honesty and sincerity, I think there are other men as well as he who know just as well what the facts are, and he is not to come



here and say the teachers do not perform their duties, and say that we have teachers, three fourths of whom are unworthy of their position.

In regard to corporal punishment, I think we should be careful in its use, and yet I think there are cases where it is necessary. The gentleman thinks a teacher should be sent to Botany Bay if he whipped a child; and he would not have a boy whipped at all. I have heard a gentleman of high standing, who had never taught school except in an academy, utter such views. Of course all expedients that can be resorted to should be employed first, but I think a boy should be punished rather than turned out of school. You will not let a teacher strike a boy, but you will let a boy go on a little further and be hanged.

It has been said that in one of the girls' schools in the city there has been no corporal punishment. Very well; but that does not prove that there ought not to be any. I know that many of our teachers of large experience and kind hearts are neglecting to punish when they feel it would be better for the school and for certain children if they did it. Some of them are yielding too much to this sickly sentimentality. I think it is quite a different thing to flog a woman from what it is to try to bring into proper subjection a little child.

*Rev. Charles Hammond, Principal of Monson Academy.* The point at issue between the parties in this controversy is not about corporal punishment, but it is punishment or no punishment, or a system of discipline that has no punishment. The clamor against inflicting blows is only to serve a purpose, to get out of a tight place; the real point at issue is, whether there shall be any such thing as punishment. I knew one man who was exceedingly opposed to corporal punishment, and his argument was that he had never had

occasion to use a rod. The reason for that was, he had a tongue which was more severe and sharp than any rod could possibly be; and that he used without stint.

This matter of using the rod is merely an incident; those who object to that, object to the use of all punishment. They talk about love, about discipline in which there is nothing uncomfortable for the wrongdoer. If you use plain talk, or any thing that induces a state of uncomfortableness, you are on the wrong side of the question. The use of a rod is a mercy compared with some hard talk we have heard. I would compel a wrongdoer to do right, by all proper means; and as to what means shall be used, that depends much upon the conscience and the culture of the people where the culprit resides. That is good, better, best, which is effectual. (Applause.)

*Mr. Hill, of Lynn.* The question with me has been, Shall I use the sharpness of the tongue, or use the rod, or give up and be governed by my pupils? I have been called a non-resistant because I would not punish a good lady's boy when she asked me to. It did not seem proper for me to punish him; for he would not come to school. For two years I kept the school without using the rod. I kept a school in Danvers some twelve years, and I never struck a boy or girl there; but I did not feel quite satisfied; I felt that I should have accomplished more for some if I had. A gentleman called to see my school, and, said he, "Have you used the rod?" I told him I had not. Said he, "Have you done your duty?" I said, "I am in doubt about it." I have changed my position since I taught those twelve years in Danvers. But I have used sharpness of tongue when I have afterwards thought I should have done better if I had used the rod. I had a school which I thought was a little more disorderly



than it ought to be, and I said to the senior scholars that I thought they should set a better example to the younger ones. I asked them candidly what they thought of their school, and made them vote on the question whether it was as orderly as it should be. Every hand was up. Then, said I, I will tell you a story about a school that was disorderly, and asked if they would like to have such a school as that. No. Would you like to remedy that, and how will you do it? If you can, will you do it? Every hand was up. I felt relieved. I went back in the afternoon, and the school went on finely that day; and the next Monday it was all right. But before the week was out the old feeling was back again. I reasoned, I talked plainly and sharply too; I reproached myself for some sharp words. But by and by a boy had trespassed so much that I thought I should try the other remedy. I told him plainly I had not punished for twelve years, but I felt that I must whip him. And I did it about right, as I thought. After school he came to me and asked, "What did you whip me for?" — "Didn't I tell you so-and-so?" — "Yes." — "Didn't I tell you to look out for me next time?" — "Yes." — "Well, this is the next time." Afterwards I asked one of the older scholars what impression that had upon the school. She said, "We knew, afterwards, that although you did not touch us, you would if we did not behave." I know that my reasoning and talking should have been enough, but it was not enough, and I had to take the other course; and now I think the school is orderly, and I am proud of it.

Here we are, men and women, full grown. Many of us are parents, and all ought to have the same objects in view that the teachers have; why should we draw apart? We need the same kind of care of children at school that they have at home. Parents need not be afraid to tell teachers about their children. I have learned not to be afraid to tell

parents about their children. We should be frank; and I know that if we understood each other better, we should be better parents and better teachers, and our scholars would be better scholars.

*Mr. B. F. Cruttenden, of New York.* Nothing lies nearer the foundation of good schools than good discipline. I studied into this matter in 1834 and 1835. Then the doctrine went over the country like a flood, that he who could not govern a school without corporal punishment, was not fit to teach a school. I was taught to believe it. I thought Solomon was mistaken. So I made up my mind that I would teach by moral suasion. I had not found out then that the doctrine was infidelity in its rankest form. But I found afterwards that instead of the teachers graduating the pupils on that plan, the pupils graduated the teachers by turning them out of the window. He who governs a school wisely and well, is doing the best thing that a human being can do.

You remember the story of the old man who found a rude boy in one of his apple-trees, and that at first he only *desired* him to come down. That was moral suasion; and that may do for ninety hundredths of the scholars. Next the old gentleman pulled up grass and leaves and made as though he would throw them at the boy; but this only made the young rogue laugh so much the more. I call all the considerations of love of school, self-respect, and regard for friends, the lighter suatives; and I could save nine out of the remaining ten by those motives. But I want the other one.

It has been said, and justly, that we should not turn a pupil into the street. Is the school for the benefit of the pupils alone? Do not I have an interest in society and in every thing around me? I am a farmer, and I help pay for the school, and I have a right to require that the children shall be

in school, and I will have them there, although I am not a teacher. But as a teacher, I claim the right to have the hundredth pupil there.

If I have ever performed an action which was influenced by sincere love, it was when I administered corporal punishment. I have seen the time when I could not get around it; and then I said, "If no kind words, if no grass will do, I will try what virtue there is in stones." (Laughter.) It is said that if you punish a boy with a rod, he will never have any self-respect. Well, I respect myself, and I presume I have had as many floggings as any person on this floor.

But what was the effect upon this boy in the apple-tree? When the harsher measure was resorted to, he hastened down; and what then? "He heartily begged the old man's pardon." The severity put him in a way to be cured of his perversity. It did not cure him, but put the criminal in the way to be cured.

I am very sorry to know that corporal punishment has ever been administered wrongly; but the very love I bear to children, the love I bear to good children, the love I bear to a wayward, erring one, whom I cannot influence except through his physical feelings, will not allow me to dispense with corporal punishment, if I can save him thus.

When there are several teachers in one school, a scholar who offends should be disciplined by the teacher in his own room, and not be sent up from the room of the sub-master to that of the master. If that is done, the necessity for punishment will be found to be lessened.

Boston will make a great mistake if she abolishes corporal punishment. It is a great matter to take a criminal and punish him; but when he needs punishment, let us do it.

*Mr. Strong*, of Connecticut, offered the following resolution :

*"Resolved*, That we extend our hearty thanks to *Mr. Lincoln* for the very able paper he has presented on the subject of School Discipline ; and we fully approve and indorse the views and opinions therein expressed."

*Dr. Ordway* read a letter from the Principal of Grammar School No. 35, in New York, expressing an opinion in opposition to corporal punishment. The Doctor said, "It is as unpopular now to whip a scholar as it was formerly to whip a slave." He said he could not explain things as they exist in Boston. He knew that the School-Board of Boston did not disapprove of the action of a teacher who punished a boy in such a way as to injure him for life. Let me say to the gentleman from Boston (*Mr. King*), that although he is in the majority now, it will not be long before he will be in the minority.

*Mr. King*. That master's conduct was disapproved by every member of the School-Committee of Boston. But he had been dismissed and settled with before his offence could be acted upon. I think it is unfair to bring in such a matter here, unexplained. (Applause.)

*Mr. Allen*, of Newton. I listened with great gratification to the reading of the paper ; but I cannot fully indorse it in every respect. I have waited long for some man with the spirit of *Horace Mann* to speak on this subject. We have run off in discussing this question into this and that particular case without being confined to the question. I think the author of the paper discussed the question. He stated that the general object of discipline should be to cultivate the whole nature. He said also that we should follow the

method of the Almighty. That I agree to. But does he follow out that idea? I think not. If I understand the method that God takes in dealing with his children, it is this: If I offend against a physical law, I am punished by physical pain; if I offend against a moral law, I am punished. If a child infringes a law of his intellect, by not developing his intellect, he is punished, he knows he is, by not being able to fill the position which he might, if he had developed his intellect as he should. Now I deny, in the presence of these gentlemen and ladies, that God ever, in his administration, punishes by physical pain, for an immoral act! I deny it. The gentleman who read the paper did not bring anywhere a case. There may be gentlemen who will rise and attempt to prove that God punishes in that way. I have never known a gentleman able to prove such a position.

I was delighted with what the gentleman from New York (Mr. Cruttenden) said, and I am sorry he has left the ranks of the teachers. I do not agree that three fourths of the teachers of Boston, or anywhere else, are unfit for their position. I believe the gentlemen and ladies who fill the place of teachers are eminently qualified for their position.

Simply because a person disagrees with me on the question whether he shall or shall not inflict personal pain as a punishment, does not disqualify him for being a teacher. I think the allusion to Charles Sumner, and applying the argument to the government, as was done in the paper, was not pertinent. We all know that the thief should be punished. Who denies that a boy or girl who steals should be punished? But shall they be punished with physical pain? The question is, Shall we inflict physical pain for little delinquencies like whispering and playing and laughing in school? We may view it as we choose, but the great community are alive to this question, and we cannot ignore it.

I wish we could hear from the judges and lawyers, and fathers and mothers on this point. I do not think teachers are the best fitted to discuss this question on all points.

The next point I would make is, that the paper, though able, did not commit itself to reform or a gradual amelioration. Nothing was said about there being far less punishment than ten years ago; and that parents do not punish now as much as they did then. You and I, Mr. President, remember that in going from house to house in our boyhood, we used to see the birch switch over the mantle-tree.

*The President.* It was not always left over the mantle in my father's family. (Laughter.)

*Mr. Allen.* It is not so much used as it was then. I have been ferruled twelve times in a day. I put it to the good sense of this assembly, if whipping so much would be tolerated now. The reform is marching on, and we have much to do with it as educators. I do not say that I would never punish, but I shall endeavor to get along with less and less. Therefore I dissent from adopting the paper in full.

*Mr. D. B. Hagar*, Principal of the Salem Normal School. I can say that I not only did not intend to speak on this subject, but I intended not to speak. But I think it is the duty of every educator to let his views be known on this question. Our schools are much influenced by public sentiment. It is proper for us to let the public know what our views are, whether they are acceptable to the community in general or not; and I, for one, am willing to let the public know where I stand, and I am willing to take my share of the odium. I indorse Mr. Lincoln's paper from first to last. (Applause.) I make this statement deliberately. The subject is one upon



which I am compelled to think; and as a teacher I must stand somewhere definitely. In years past I have been compelled to act; and I am now compelled to instruct, if not to act. I am not ready to go with some of the good people of the Commonwealth, and say there must be no physical punishment. The subject is a broad one, and has been ably discussed by Mr. Lincoln.

I will touch upon only one or two points. My first point is, that my friend, Mr. Allen's, position, is utterly groundless, that God never visits moral wrong with physical punishment. Is there any moral wrong worse than debauchery? And pray tell me what more bitter punishment can fall on a man than from that sin?

*Mr. Allen.* I say it is a physical as well as a moral wrong.

*Mr. Hagar.* What makes wrong? The physical act, or the moral nature of it. The mere motion of my hand involves no moral quality; but if I strike my venerable friend before me, it does. How do we know that these things are wrong? Because God visits them with penalties for the acts. Therefore we say they are wrong. If there is any thing clear in morals, it is that God does visit these acts with physical penalties for moral wrongs. The great moral wrongs against which society is contending, are exhibited through the physical powers.

It is said we are reformers. True; but we must not reform the wrong way. It is said that things are better now than in former times. I admit that in some respects they are. But, let me ask, are children more obedient now than in former days? Do children obey their parents better now than they used to? Do children show more respect

for their parents and for elders than they used to? I believe that in many respects children have improved. I believe that while in some directions we have made an immense gain, in some we have made a loss.

We have been cited to that most excellent man, Horace Mann. I admit that he did and said many things which were good, and for which he deserves the respect of the world; but I deem it no more than just to say, that while Horace Mann protested against the rod, if we may judge of the sarcasms that he inflicted on his opponents, no man could pen more bitter words.

There is something worse than flogging. I have known teachers use words that went to the very heart of the child. I have seen children wither beneath the scorching words of the teacher. If my child must be whipped with a stick, or flogged with the wagging tongue of a sarcastic teacher, give my child the stick.

When these statements are made about schools that do not use the rod, we do not get at the arcana. I want to know what is said, and what sort of gymnastics the pupils have to go through; how many have their ears pulled, or their hair pulled, and what tortures of the Inquisition they have to endure as a substitute for a good, honest flogging. At the same time, I know teachers who are able to govern schools without a rod and without severity of any sort. If three fourths of our teachers are unfit to teach, pray what is to become of three fourths of our children?

I know that those who take the ground that I now do, are likely to be considered in favor of the common use of the rod. I am not. It would be as absurd to claim that the use of the rod is a severe remedy, as it would to argue that the cutting off a limb by a surgeon is a severe thing. It is not a pleasant thing, but it must be done. And it is not a pleasant



thing to remove tumors from the person, but it may be necessary. It does not seem to be any more wrong to inflict a reasonable penalty in the form of a flogging, than to perform a surgical operation. The fact that some man or woman uniformly uses the rod, is no argument against flogging. I might say that through the stupid act of a physician a dear friend was sent to the grave. I might have said such a thing as that; but it would be very unkind and very unjust to charge all physicians, as a class, with want of skill on that account. So it is unjust to charge teachers, as a class, as being unfit for their duties, because, now and then, one uses the rod improperly.

I say there are cases of necessity for the use of the rod; and I do not say as a last resort. I would use the highest motives first, and then one less high; and then the only one which you find will influence the child. But there may be cases in which the teacher knows the highest motives will not influence the child, and to save the child it may be necessary to use the severer measures at once.

My own practice has been to whip once in about seven years. So that I am not speaking as one who feels that he must defend himself. But I do not think it is fair to say to the young teachers present, you must not whip a child under any circumstances, because it is infamous. I stand as an encourager of those who, in a good conscience and in duty, feel it necessary to whip a child. I have whipped my own children, not in anger, but in love, and because I love them. And let me say, that never has a child of mine shown more affection toward me than immediately after I have justly and lovingly punished him. (Applause.)

*Mr. Hammond*, of Monson. I feel that this subject is very important, and that the discussion should be continued.

I therefore move that the subject be postponed to some future time, that there may be a fuller expression. I think such a subject should have precedence with teachers. Within the past year there have been influences in Boston and Cambridge, those centres of influence, which are important. I therefore move that the further consideration of the subject be postponed till to-morrow forenoon at eleven o'clock.

After some further suggestions, the resolution offered by Mr. Strong was referred back to the mover, that it be presented in a new draft.

*Mr. Lincoln*, in answer to the claim that *Horace Mann* was opposed to the use of corporal punishment, read from the published declarations of *Mr. Mann*, a few sentences, such as, "I coincide with those who think that corporal punishment should be used;" "I admit it is a less evil than occasional disobedience;" "I blame no teacher for corporal punishment;" "It must be a reality, and not a sham;" "The object of it is to avert an evil greater than itself — a permanent evil, by a temporary one."

The whole subject was then postponed till to-morrow forenoon, at eleven o'clock, and the Institute adjourned till a quarter before seven o'clock in the evening.

#### EVENING SESSION.

*Prof. Seelye*, of Amherst, who was expected to give the lecture this evening, was unable to be present on account of sickness in his family, and *C. O. Thompson, Esq.*, Principal of the High School in Arlington, was introduced as the lecturer, who gave a very interesting lecture upon the subject

of Teaching as a Profession, discussing the subject under the three following heads :—

- 1st. There is no such profession recognized.
- 2d. There is a field to be occupied, to be determined by the organic structure of American society.
- 3d. The times demand immediate action on the part of the public, as well as of teachers themselves, to establish such a profession.

## SECOND DAY.

THURSDAY MORNING, Aug. 1, 1867.

J. W. Bulkley, Esq., of Brooklyn, New York, one of the Vice-Presidents, called the Institute to order this morning at nine o'clock.

The Institute was opened with prayer by Rev. Mr. Stebbins, of Springfield.

## DISCUSSION.

The subject of discussion assigned for this morning was, "*The place Natural History should occupy in a Course of Instruction.*"

Isaac F. Cady, Esq., of Rhode Island, opened the discussion by reading a well-prepared paper on the subject, which will be found in another part of the volume.

The subject was then open for discussion by members of the Institute.

Mr. Cruttenden. This paper does not need a discussion. I feel free to say that it is the best presentation of the subject to which I have ever listened, or have ever read. It carries its own conviction with it. Said an old pioneer to me, — a man whose back was crooked with rheumatism and who was out of shape generally, — "You see how I am deformed?" — "I do." — "That was done by hard work." — "Do you think," said I, "that you have spent your life wisely and well in laboring thus while others come to enjoy your fields?" Said he, "I am content; I have done good, and I leave my family a nice home which they will enjoy." I admired the old pioneer; I admire pioneers in teaching. Words, words,

nothing but words, was the teaching of my early school-life. Now what is the consolation in those words? One lesson, such as we have had to-day, in the right spirit, would have been worth more than all the spelling-book which was ever crammed down me. Of course we have lost the time and opportunity to be thus taught. But shall we go with the book of nature open before us and not read it? I cannot have the consolations that I might, of the works of God as I have seen them. Why? Because the whole system of school supervision, when I was in school, was wrong; it was made up of abstractions, — words instead of ideas and thoughts.

This question will help answer the question in regard to school discipline. If the mind of the scholar is occupied with studies of this sort, the idle mind, which is "the devil's workshop," will become occupied, and the old workman will not succeed. I rejoice that the time has come when the youth will be put upon the right track of study, in the right time and place, when there will be no more five, or six, or eight dreary years of not much to be done, and trying to find something to employ children till they are old enough to learn something.

How frequently we have said it was important to learn the words of the dictionary. Why? Because it kept the children busy. It is exactly the argument of Mrs. Toodles, when she bought the wheelbarrow, and the old lamp-post, and the door-plate with the name "Tompkins" upon it. When her husband expostulated, she replied, "Yes, I know we have no use for it now; but if we should have a daughter, and she should marry a man by the name of Tompkins, how nice it would be to have a door-plate ready for them!"

The whole system of teaching words, was nothing but sound — to me at least. After I left college, I had one day of shooting; and in my travels I walked across a bridge, whilst

my dog went down through the ditch and up on the other side. I said to myself, "A bridge, — to shorten," as I had for the thousandth time and more in the course of my life (for when I was a little boy I had been taught to give definitions, as they are called, from the spelling-book, while the teacher gave the words); "abandon, — to give up, to forsake; abase, — to bring low; abet, — to encourage, to assist; abide, — to dwell in a place; abound, — to have plenty; abridge, — to shorten." Now, after learning this definition, I had never crossed a bridge in a road without saying to myself, "A bridge, — to shorten," but never thought what it meant. But this time, I observed that my path was much shorter than the dog's, and then I realized, for the first time, that, "to shorten," had been the definition of a bridge. (Laughter.)

Now, suppose the teacher had brought in a flower or a leaf to talk about, he could not have failed to interest his scholars, and do them more good than by their learning words only, with their definitions, by means of other words that the child could not understand. We may be spurred on to better methods of study by telling our own experience. I would give more to be able to-day to classify the different minerals with which I come in contact, than to be able to give the definitions in Webster's dictionary.

But some one may say, that would be undervaluing language. No: the best foundation for the study of language is this study of natural history. Words are signs of ideas. When do we want words? When we have ideas. If you would have a child know the meaning of a word, give him the idea. Then ideas are precious and inviting, and words are inviting because they are the means by which ideas are represented. Every word thus known is a familiar thing, and will be spelled and pronounced correctly; and it becomes an additional source of power as a means by which thoughts are made known.

If I could wipe out the present course of instruction, I would place language first, natural science next, mathematics last. I would place language first, because God taught language first. Even in the nature of the brute, he has given emotional language. For us, science furnishes the idea, and language furnishes the way to express the idea. Any system which divorces the two is false to nature—I am not a heathen—it is false to God. The new system must prevail, because it is common sense; it is God's own good sense.

*John B. Perry, Esq.*, of Burlington, Vt., said: I think this is one of the most important subjects that can come up for consideration. We see at once the place it should occupy when we look at the nature of it. We are first taught to read artificial language. Natural science is God's language. The plant, the animal, are expressions of God's thoughts. What should the child be taught to read? He should be taught to read nature, the whole world around him; natural language instead of books. It is important to be able to read the pebble, to know what it means, to read minerals and animals, and what God would tell us by them.

One word as to the method. It is well to have a child taught principles, but that is not the first thing. The first thing should be to be taught what minerals, plants, animals, and insects are. Let the teacher understand these things, and have exercises in them frequently, and he will find that more may be done in the way of discipline in this than in any other way.

*David Crosby, Esq.*, of Nashua, N. H. I was not so fortunate as to hear the paper introducing this topic read; and I have heard but a few of the remarks of those who have discussed the subject. I came here to get instruction, and I trust I shall.



But I recollect reading somewhere among the ancients (it was not a remark of any one in the nineteenth century, and, therefore, will be passed over lightly): An ancient philosopher was asked what boys should learn when they were young, and he said, "Things that it will be necessary for them to remember when they become men." I rather thought it was a wise saying, but perhaps it was not. While the gentleman was telling about teaching these natural sciences I thought, How shall I do it if the children know nothing of that artificial language? And then, I wish to know what nine tenths of our children want to know about crystallography and botany? If they were going to dig in the mines, they might wish to know something about minerals; but if they want to know how to cook a good dinner, they may not. I think they should begin with artificial language. How can they express their ideas, unless they know the meaning of words? When they see there is happiness, how can they express it? They see a lamb jump up. What do they know about "jump up," if they don't know the meaning? When I went to school, my mother said I must study rhetoric. I had never been out of the district, and when I began to study rhetoric I was asked, "What is *Taste*?"—"The power of receiving pleasure or pain from the beauties or deformities of nature or art." I thought I knew something about taste. I thought I knew what a good mince pie was; but I studied it, for I was bound to remember. I went over those things, and they are profitable to me now. I have not got into a life insurance office, nor a doctor's trade, and I find these things profitable to me yet. We must know something of language, before we can study natural science. A young lady came to my school, and wanted to study botany. "Do you know anything about it?"—"Yes; it is the knowledge of flowers."—"Do you know the meaning of



those words?"—"No; I don't wish to learn the meaning of words and names, but only how to analyze plants." You may get a class of twenty, and they will not follow it. They like to hear a fine talk, and they will listen to what you will say about a mineral or a plant; but when you put them to the science and the study, it is as foreign from what they want as anything can be possibly imagined. I might prescribe a course of study that would suit some; but you must take everybody. If these things are to be studied first, I fear they will never learn anything. I wish to know how children are to learn, if they don't know anything about the dictionary. I prize it more than my friend does. If I could not have but one, I should prize it more than a knowledge of crystals and plants. How shall I go to work to get these ideas of things into persons who know nothing about artificial language?

*Prof. Atkinson, of Cambridge.* I differ so entirely from the gentleman who has just sat down, that I must relieve my mind. I cannot do it better than by an illustration. I have the misfortune to be a committee-man. I went into a school where the teacher was pursuing the course which, if I understood the gentleman, he would have pursued, teaching the artificial language, — teaching a large room-full of pupils, all over twelve, the beauties of spelling such words as "homogeneous, irregularity, mineralogy." Not an idea had the children of what the words meant; but they were learning language. It happened, a few days after, that I went into a primary school in this city, where the teacher was teaching a small class of children, almost babes, in a different way. She had the primer, and she was beginning a lesson which the children had never seen; and the lesson was about an eagle; there was a picture of the eagle. She turned the attention of the children to the picture. "What is that?"—

"Why, it is a bird."—"Well, what do you see? what sort of a head has it?" The little children had been trained in that way, so that they gave a very pretty account of the curved beak, and the wings, and the kind of feet, and of what the eagle had in its claws. Now, said the teacher, let us spell eagle. Accordingly the word was put on the blackboard, the silent letters were marked, till the whole school could spell the word. Then there was a discussion about the character and habits of the eagle. The children were asked if they had ever seen an eagle, and taught to tell what sort of a bird it was. Then they took their slates and wrote, or printed, something they had learned about the eagle. It occurred to me that that was a better way to learn artificial language, and I told my teacher so, than the unhappy spelling book. She said she disliked it as much as I did, but the committee made her use it.

I cannot see that there is this contradiction between teaching language and teaching science. So far from it, it seems to me, that the teaching of natural history is teaching language. Is not all language figurative? Where does our language come from but from these objects which God has given? The reason why we fail in teaching language in school is, because we do not take the natural method, and teach natural history first, and teach children to use their senses, putting the object before words, and not the words foremost.

We are discussing the subject of the study of natural history; and I think we are actually discussing at the same time the true way of teaching language also. If the gentleman wishes to attain his object, he cannot adopt a better way than that described in the admirable paper read this morning. The true order of study is the great thing to learn now. We have good houses and good apparatus, and in

that direction there is little more to be done; but in the matter of the order in which we shall teach in these houses, we have scarcely made a beginning yet. We go on in the old routine, teaching the same things that were taught a century ago, and often in the same way, while at the same time the philosophy of mind has made progress. We know from the dire results of our teaching that the method and order are wrong. It seems to me that this commencement of an interest in object-teaching, so called, is the beginning of a reformation; that it is laying the foundation of instruction right, and is putting what should come first, first; namely, things themselves; and then building upon that as a solid foundation, that instruction in language, which I believe I value as much as the gentleman from Nashua, and which, taught in the usual manner, is so often a failure. Therefore I was happy to hear that paper, and I hope more will be done in this matter.

The bugbear seems to be that there is something so difficult in these studies that they cannot be introduced into a school. That teacher was teaching natural history when she talked about the eagle. With all due respect to the gentleman from Nashua, I think his pupils know as much about the subject as he does himself, when they bring in their flowers and wish to know something about them. The learned words are not botany: it is to go out and gather the flowers and leaves, and compare them together. What teacher cannot do that? Let children have *things*, and then have the *words*. But if you undertake to cram the botany-book down the children, I do not wonder there is no success.

I would have every primary school have a little museum; and I would have every child in town know the trees and flowers that grow there, and what the soil of the place is; what birds live there, and wild animals, and what are their

characters and habits. I have just taken out of the post-office *The American Naturalist*, published in Salem, just the thing for every child to have for gaining instruction upon this subject. I wish it could be taken in every school in the country.

*Mr. Crosby.* I don't know whether the gentleman was agreeing with me or not. I should agree with him in the manner of studying about the eagle. If a child does not understand words, I don't see how he could understand the head or any other part. I would like to inquire how a large portion of the children in New Hampshire, who never go to school more than from three to six months in a year, can get these things, and the other things which are necessary. I wish to have children learn to spell "eagle," and how to spell "head;" and that should be learned at the same time perhaps. Can any one give me the natural name for an eagle, or for a rose? If there is any natural language, I would like to know it, and I will put down the characters now.

*Dr. Cornell.* This use of books or things is not new. In Brown University, Dr. Messer once asked, "How do you get a knowledge of external things?" One fellow in the class stood as much like a post as possible, very near to a post in the recitation-room. As he hesitated, the Doctor asked, "How do you know there is a post before you?"—"I see it."—"Would you know it if you struck your head against it?"—"Yes." Thus the Doctor got out the idea which he wished. Then came Dr. Wayland. We studied Kames's *Elements of Criticism* without books, and though we made pretty blundering work at first, we finally got along very well. Afterwards we used the book some, and we could take a whole chapter and go through with it. I think these gentlemen are

all right, and all wrong nearly. I wish to combine the two methods. I wish to have the eagle, but I wish to have something go with it. I think the old system of being confined wholly to books, was a bad one. To undertake to teach by the book, is like cooking by book; we may book it, but never cook it.

The discussion was suspended here.

*Mr. A. P. Stone*, from the Committee to whom was referred the matter of the amendment of the Constitution, reported that they deemed it expedient to defer action for one year. They found an amendment, something like the one proposed, which was offered as long ago as 1841, and they could not find, in the brief time they could give to the examination of the records, what was the action in regard to it. It was difficult to understand, without further investigation, what is the precise form of the Constitution now. The Committee therefore recommend the adoption of the following resolution:

*"Resolved*, That a committee of three be appointed to examine the Constitution and Records of the Institute, and report the Constitution as it now stands, with such amendments as may be deemed expedient at the next annual meeting."

The report of the Committee was accepted, and the recommendation for the appointment of a committee was adopted.

On motion by *Mr. Geo. T. Littlefield*, the committee who had already reported, were appointed to continue their examination, and report at the next annual meeting.

*Rev. Mr. Northrop* called attention to the fact that this meeting of the Institute was honored by the presence of a large delegation, sent by the New-York State Teachers' As-

sociation, and stated that at the meeting of the officers of the Institute yesterday, it was unanimously voted to extend a cordial welcome to the delegates, and invite them to participate in the exercises of this meeting.

*Mr. Bulkley.* In behalf of this delegation, I thank you for extending this courtesy.

*Rev. Mr. Northrop.* We should not omit to extend the thanks of this Institute for the honor your Association has done us, in sending this delegation.

#### DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.

*The President.* I think it desirable that something should be heard by the Institute, in regard to the Department of Education, as established by Congress.

As the Commissioner of Education is present, I will invite him, in behalf of the Institute, to give us a general idea of the department, and of its work.

#### REMARKS OF HON. HENRY BARNARD.

*Hon. Henry Barnard.* I will not, Mr. President, abuse the privilege you have accorded to me, by trespassing upon your time, so as to defer your action on other matters at the hour which is near at hand. My main object in complying with the request of the President is, to explain somewhat the nature of the law which creates, for the first time, the Department of Education at Washington, so far as we can point out the plan by its operations.

It will be remembered that the subject has been up for discussion several times, and a committee has been appointed



twice by this Institute, asking for some national recognition of the subject. It had been before presented by individuals from different parts of the country. It was desired to have at Washington some national recognition of this great cause of education. A little more than a year ago, a convention of superintendents met at Washington, authorized to present a memorial to Congress. This was presented by Gen Garfield in the House, and the committee to which it was referred reported a bill creating a Department of Education. The subject came up for discussion in the House, and at first it did not meet the favor its friends expected; but it finally passed by a two-thirds vote. It went to the Senate, and was sent to the judiciary committee, of which Mr. Trumbull of Illinois was chairman. That committee reported in favor of the passage of the bill as it came from the House. It was discussed briefly, and passed that body without a division. And after the adjournment of Congress, the President did me the honor to invite me to an interview, and was kind enough to nominate me to the Senate, and I was confirmed; and the next day I entered upon the duties of my office.

Two or three points in this very brief act, which embraces only three sections, are all to which I can call your attention. The first is the name; and then give you some idea of the character of the department, so that we may act together to keep it from the political whirlpool which would swamp it.

The argument for calling it a department was, not to give it increased dignity, but to keep it from the other departments, so that the head of it may not be changed, with the change in the other departments, and that he might make his appointments from those who had made teaching a study and a business. If this department is carried out in the spirit in which the act was passed, it will be fortunate.

The power given to this department is very small. It does

not recognize any intention on the part of the government to create a system of national education; nothing of the kind was contemplated. So far as I am called upon to administer it, my aim will be to carry out literally the provisions of the law, — to collect and disseminate information, so as to show the condition and progress of education in the States and Territories, so as to aid the people of the United States in establishing school systems.

It gives the head of the department the appointment of three clerks only; and no provision has been made, thus far, for the incidental expenses of the office. I mention this, that the friends of education may not be expecting too much from a head of a department which has no connection with any of the systems of education in any State, and must depend entirely upon the voluntary co-operation of friends of education. If they respond fully and cheerfully in forwarding the information sought, the department can have some means by which the reports can be made, which the law contemplates shall be made only to Congress. There have been only two steps taken by Congress. One is that there shall be a history of all the various land-grants made to the several States for education, and their condition. You are aware that millions of acres of land have been given for the purpose of aiding education in the territories.

Congress had had a department at Washington, to which there should have been some report, as to the application of the funds. If the history of the application of the money from the lands, in one State, had been known before action was taken in another State, millions would have been saved. It is not too much to say, that if the funds from appropriations made since 1787, had been husbanded with the same discretion that a gentleman husbands his private property, we should have \$500,000,000 for this great work of public

instruction. There is not to be found in Washington, the material for giving the history of any one of these land-grants, except the mere amount; and it would require, if some of us had not already made investigations in that direction, all the force of the department, for years, to give an intelligent history of these grants.

Congress has made one other specific direction which is, that the Commissioner shall report on the condition of the schools in the District of Columbia. We are taking steps to obtain a minute statement of the condition of education there. I hope the constituents will breathe a spirit of patriotism into their representatives, to see if we cannot make the course of education there such as shall be worthy of a capital which bears the name of Washington.

There are peculiarities with regard to the population of the city, which those who have not resided there can hardly appreciate. A very large proportion of the property is owned by the government, not a dollar being taxed; and the government retains millions of property which would be subject to taxation but for certain reservations. It is therefore a duty to make an equivalent for this property. But apart from that, it should, at least, organize or provide for the organization of an efficient system of public schools.

The only way in which this department can act on the cause of education is, by collecting and diffusing information. And on that subject we are crippled. Congress has made no sufficient provision for this work. We shall endeavor to do something by such resources as we can command; but to do the work which I have marked out for myself, will require the hearty co-operation of the educators of the country, and will necessarily require some appropriation by the government.

The mode in which I shall try to disseminate information

will be, to answer the various questions which are addressed to me. I need only the experience of the last ten days to convince me that this department will have quite as much to do as such a staff of officers can perform. I have received a letter from Nevada, asking me to send them documents by which they can organize a normal school for that State, so that they may know what is done on that subject in the Atlantic States. There is no such document except the one which I have prepared myself. I have received from the State of Georgia a request to frame a code of instruction for that State. I have been asked to answer what is the best system in the country; to give the features which should go into it. The sending of documents would be a simple matter; but to give information on what is required, would be a great work. It is my intention to have a document within a few months, which shall be of value, not only for Georgia, but for every State. It is my purpose to prepare a code of the laws in every State, and prepare a digest on the subject, so that every student can see what is done in every State on the subject of education.

I have a letter from Tennessee, asking me to be at a convention at Knoxville, which is intended to take up the subject of education for the State. I have had a letter from West Virginia, asking for the best plan for school-houses for rural districts. We know something of the importance of that subject. Attaching a few pages to a little almanac in Rhode Island, revolutionized that State on the subject. I have letters from gentlemen in the constitutional conventions now being held in New York, Michigan, and Maryland, asking information. In order to meet the wants of those who may be hereafter engaged in constitutional conventions, I am preparing a little monogram, giving a history of the provisions on the subject in every State. I have also re-

ceived a letter from Iowa, asking information respecting systems of education abroad. Also from Texas, a letter asking for information on certain points, so that they may act in the light of the experience of the older States, so as to enable them to establish their University on the right ground. I wish to be able to give the experience of States, institutions, and educators, on any one subject, and all subjects that concern schools.

I have no prejudices of my own to impose on the country. It has been my aim to bring to bear the light of past and present experience. My belief is, that anything worth preserving has its roots in the past; and to make us grow we need all the light which can be brought to bear from every country. My documents, which I shall send out, will be constructed on the plan to give the experience of States and individuals who have devoted their lives to the department of education.

I shall aim, in the course of the present year, to issue a monthly circular, in which I shall ask such questions as I may find necessary in the administration of the office. These will be sent to any teacher in any part of the country who may signify a desire to receive them. They will not always contain matter new or original. I shall draw from the resources of the latest fifteen years of study. It is known that the very work which I am now engaged in doing, is one which I have been trying to do in my own individual way, and at my own individual expense. I can now draw, not only from my own experience, but from that of more than a hundred educators in the country. Anything that I have will be given gratuitously to any one who will apply for it.

The success and efficiency of this department must depend on the hearty co-operation of the friends of education. It has no political support. It could not have been carried

through Congress on any political consideration, so far as I know. It was from the presentation of the manner in which it would act, by diffusing heat, light, and warmth throughout the country, that it was successful in being established. It has no patronage to give. In the employment of the few clerks, the selection will be, so far as possible, from those who have had experience in education. Of course, members of Congress can have no expectation of the appointment of particular friends.

With these explanations to the friends of education, and with their hearty co-operation, a large amount of information will be gathered from various parts of the country; and in a series of documents, prepared with as much rapidity as possible, I hope we shall have facilities for helping those who wish to build up institutions of learning and frame systems of education. One of the few things which will be presented for the first time, will be a document which will give the name of every teacher; and we shall have an array of one hundred and fifty thousand names; and of hundreds and thousands of names of institutions scattered throughout the country; and through this document, we can at once communicate what the entire body of educators are doing in the country. This cannot be done without the cordial and prompt co-operation of the friends of education throughout the country.

*Mr. Northrop.* Mr. President, I have drawn up the following resolution, while listening to the interesting statement of Dr. Barnard, which I beg leave to offer :

*"Resolved,* That we tender our hearty thanks to the Hon. Henry Barnard, for his lucid statement of the character and aims of the new national department of education; that we cordially commend the recent action of Congress in establishing a national department



of education, and that, from its appropriate work of collecting and diffusing information as to the best systems of education for towns, cities, and States, the evils still remaining, and the remedies and changes needed, we anticipate the happiest results to the whole country. We deem education one of the chief agents needed in the wise reconstruction of States, and especially in fraternizing the people of the North and South, and we bespeak the wise co-operation of all classes in this one greatest and most vital interest of the nation."

*Rev. Charles Brooks*, of Boston. Mr. President,—I second the acceptance of the resolution; and I would append to it a vote of thanks to my friend, for the very lucid explanation which he has given us of the department of which he is the head. There are few persons on this globe who can rejoice with a warmer heart than I do at the progress of this great national work. Contemplated in 1839, it has been a point before the eye of faith from that moment till this. The day is dawning; God grant that under the guidance of the learning and experience and the Christian character of him who stands at the head of it, the time may be not far distant when the system of education which God has in his mind, and which we hope to adopt, will be adopted here; when a child at the age of five can enter the primary school of his native town, pass through that to the grammar school, through that to the high school, through that to the free State college, through that to the national university, and graduate at the age of twenty-four, prepared for all the duties which he, in the choice of his trade or profession, may require; that the sources of information shall be developed according to the opening faculties, in their natural order, in proper times and due proportions; so that, when the course is completed, there has been an idea of God copied.

Let me illustrate my idea by an allusion. Kepler, after he had discovered those laws of motion, when he had finished the last demonstration, and then saw each planet moving in its orbit, as the Creator had designed, fell on his knees and made this explanation: "Oh, God, I know thee and thy thoughts after thee!" Let us have a system of education which is on this plan, and it will make America the *alpha* of the world. (Applause.)

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

REMARKS OF DR. MCKINNEY, OF TEXAS.

*The President*, at this time, called attention to the fact that Dr. McKinney, President of Austin College, Texas, was present, and invited him to occupy a few minutes in addressing the Institute.

*Dr. McKinney* said:—I am very much obliged to you, Mr. President, for the courtesy. I am a stranger here; and I would simply remark, that if Dr. Barnard would issue something like an educational monthly, from the information received by him, and have that circulated North and South, it might be to us, teachers, of great service. This is simply a suggestion.

Mr. President, I am pleased, and I take this occasion to say so, at the courtesy extended to me. I am a stranger here, from the far West, though I am a Northern man, educated in Philadelphia. But I have been thirty-seven years in the South-west; and I will say to the president and this respectable audience, that it affords me great pleasure to meet you face to face. In former years, it has been my pleasure to visit Philadelphia, the home of my boyhood, and review the reminiscences of old Dr. Wiley, who, by the way, used to employ the birch pretty freely.

I came North with a view to obtain information and books, for the purpose of building up education in that great South-west, where we have a State larger than the whole of New England,—large enough to make five States as large as Virginia. We are struggling there, and especially at Austin College, where I have been for the last eighteen years; and we need light and information. If there could be a concentration of that information which Dr. Barnard proposes to obtain, in a monthly, and sent over the country, it would burn and give a blaze of light for the whole nation.

## DISCUSSION RESUMED.

The subject of school discipline was again taken up for further discussion.

*Mr. Crosby* wished to ask *Mr. Allen*, of Newton, who criticized the paper of *Mr. Lincoln*, whether he affirmed that God never visits physical transgression with a moral penalty. *Mr. Allen* not being present to answer, the point was deferred until he should return.

*Dr. Morrill Wyman*, of Cambridge. The question I wish to ask, before proceeding with the discussion, is, whether it is to be exclusively confined to the uses, and not a word said about the unfortunate results that sometimes follow.

*The President.* The gentleman will be allowed to take his own course.

*Dr. Wyman.* It is pretty well known that at one time flogging in the navy was a very common thing. Perhaps it is not as well known that the medical officer was always ordered to examine the victim before corporal punishment

was administered, and he was always charged to stand by and witness the punishment, and it was at his risk if the sailor thereby became disabled so as not to be able to perform his duties to the public. Now, when the question of corporal punishment is to be carried elsewhere, is it improper for a medical gentleman to come forward, and that any information which he possesses should be given, which may seem likely to prevent society from getting that advantage which it ought? And although that medical gentleman may not know how much punishment a teacher ought to inflict, he may know better than another what the pupil is able to bear.

In what I have to say, I have no desire to interfere with the action of teachers, nor diminish in any respect the value of that high vocation. All that I wish is to increase their respect and usefulness in the community. But I think I have a duty to perform in that regard, which may be, in some respects, disagreeable. I have a duty as a citizen; but perhaps I have something more at this time.

Within two months, a professional gentleman requested me to see his wife, who, he said, was sinking in consumption. There was little to be done, but he wished me to see her. She was upon her bed, emaciated; her voice was in a whisper. My visit was done, and I was about leaving. She called me back and said, with such strength as she could gather, "I have children in the public schools. I have all the anxieties of a mother for them, and I could not go without thanking you for your efforts for the school children. I request you to continue your efforts, and I believe that many who have opposed you will ere long be with you." It was the only time I saw her. In four days she had died. I trust I shall never forget that request, nor the spirit that pervaded it.

I take it for granted that every teacher would abandon the use of corporal punishment if he were convinced that he could win greater success, with greater ease, without it than with it. I believe the time has arrived for the abandonment of it with respect to girls; and I think I may say with regard to corporal punishment, that it is fast disappearing from the community in regard to all offences; and, wherever it has disappeared, I do not know that it has been revived. There was a time when it was believed that good order could not be preserved without the whipping-post. That post was so located, and the time for its use so chosen, that the children, when returning from school, could witness it. But that time has passed; and even Gov. Orr, of South Carolina, declared, last December, that a man who had been whipped had not sufficient heart to try to reform. And so, on shipboard, the use of the lash has been proved to be unnecessary. It is forbidden by act of Congress, not only in the navy, but in the mercantile marine. So, again, in the prisons and houses of reformation, where it was once used, it is now forbidden; it was found, even for the worst of criminals, worse than useless.

In lunatic asylums, it was once thought that as the inmates were unreasoning they must be governed by fear; and I remember well that more than forty years ago persons were brought to a neighboring asylum by persons with a whip in the hand to control them. The keeper was amazed at their being quiet when the whip was removed. He said it was the eye of my father. It was the omnipotence of loving power. It is that which I would like to see extended into other fields.

All those things have now disappeared. No man, in any civilized community, would now dare to strike an insane person. Every one here knows it is wrong; and yet there is

not such a great difference between an insane person and a young child. In the one, the faculties are excited, or not equally developed; and in the other, they are undeveloped, and their treatment is not different. The greater part of the treatment of the insane is moral treatment. That is the great force by which people are restored to health of mind.

Let us see how it is with European schools, — whether they continue the use of the rod there. With regard to Holland, not a blow has legally fallen upon a child in the public schools for a quarter of a century and more. In Prussia it is strictly forbidden with regard to girls, and with regard to boys it is only very rarely used, and then with the consent of the parent. In Austria, more than thirty years ago it was expressly forbidden, except in the presence of the parent of the child; and now it has ceased altogether. It is pretty much the same in France. This is the testimony collected from the best sources within my reach. It is that the amount of corporal punishment in Europe is far below the amount in Massachusetts, and that in that respect our school system is far behind. In this matter, things are more favorable in some schools. In Phillips Exeter Academy, not a blow has been struck for a quarter of a century. In private schools for girls, I do not think such punishment is used. If it is, I would not give much for the income of the teacher. With regard to the Sabbath school, I never knew but one instance in which corporal punishment was used, and in that case the superintendent was immediately dismissed, as no gentleman.

I now wish to look at the question of the differences of sex, and I will confine my attention particularly to the corporal punishment of females. Heretofore, the question has come up in school-committees, where a large majority of the committees are clergymen, as a theological question.



I admit, once for all, that the soul of a girl and that of a boy are the same. I confine myself to physical characteristics. That there are differences in moral characteristics, I think every parent will have observed. The girl is sensitive, emotional, and early occupied with the impressions she makes upon others. That exquisite sensibility which marks the woman, has its germ in the child. She knows instinctively that she cannot depend upon physical strength, and is, therefore, docile and ready to lean upon those on whom she depends for protection. She clings to her teacher, and, if she will let her, she loves her, and exhibits that love with a simplicity and frankness that few can resist. It is these qualities with which the faithful and wise teacher leads her, and finds that corporal punishment would be worse than useless; it would be cruelty itself.

There are physiological differences. She is more sensitive in her nervous system, and more awake to emotions from within and influences from without. It is this which prevents her from joining in the ruder sports of boys, and should protect her from their harsher punishment. She spends much of her early life in school, and, during that time, is wayward in thought and sentiment; and, I very much fear, has sometimes received blows when she should have received sympathy and kindness, and that she has suffered for that for which she was answerable to God alone. She becomes a woman with rapidity, with all a woman's hopes and fears; and she now knows that her hopes in life depend upon the impression she makes upon others. Her nature becomes doubly sensitive now. Shall such a being be subjected to corporal punishment? We may count the blows; we may see the marks left upon her body; but her wounded spirit, her degradation,—who can tell the years that may elapse before the consequences will disappear? It is this which

has stirred the sensibilities, and brought down the censures of a great part of the civilized world, when it was known that a woman was whipped in one of our public schools, and from none was that censure more severe than from the lips of cultivated women. A blow of equal severity administered upon a girl, produces more serious consequences than when administered upon a boy. When we remember that diseases of the brain are early developed, we should be cautious. I say this not without reason. The City of Cambridge is paying for the board of a young woman at the Lunatic Asylum at Worcester, who became paralytic, and afterwards insane, from blows received from a ferrule in the hands of a female teacher. For what is a teacher willing to incur the responsibility of such awful results? For whispering, or a defect in a lesson? To save from the effect upon the teacher himself, I could wish that corporal punishment might be abolished.

But there is another thing which has to do, not with the person punished, but with those gentle and sensitive natures that witness the punishment; and the more refined and gentle those children, the more serious the injury. Who has not witnessed the distress of a little girl on seeing one of her mates punished? Schools were not made for naughty children alone; good children have rights there, and those rights should be respected. I know of nothing that would reconcile me to let my daughter hear the screams caused by blows. It may be said that this occurs but once in the course of a girl's experience in school. I know of no branch of knowledge which I would not rather my daughter should forego, than to have her sensibilities so blunted that she can witness such things unmoved. Has not corporal punishment of young women lessened the respect which is due to them from the other sex? It is that respect which makes all the difference between civilization and barbarism. And may it

not be that the numerous instances of maltreatment by husbands of their wives, among the lower classes, may be traced to the fact of corporal punishment at schools? What answer can be made when a husband says to a wife, "If you had been in a public school, and shown half the impudence that you show to me, you would have been whipped?"

Again, as to the effect upon the teachers themselves: Can a person who invents an instrument for the purpose of inflicting stripes and pain, do that without having his sensibilities blunted? History is full of instances that show the effect. Those cognizant with the scenes in our criminal courts understand this. It is sometimes said, and it is an argument *ad medicum*, that a surgeon often produces pain. But can you show an instance in which a surgeon invents an instrument for the express purpose of giving pain? I need only point to those twin stars, ether and opium, which shed their influence over the whole earth.

Any part of a school system must reveal the heart and spirit of the whole community. I notice in a report from the committee of Waltham, that teachers were losing the respect of the community. I fear there is something true in it. I suspect that those complaints at Waltham do not come from those who are managing our girls without blows, but from those who are managing them with them. I think the picture of a strong man, whipping a little girl of six or seven, or a young woman of seventeen, is not a pleasant one. When the community say that they wish to have their daughters educated without blows, I have no doubt persons can be found who will do it. I say this, after having witnessed the success with which some of our gifted teachers have managed their schools without blows.

But, it is said, there must be a reserved force somewhere; it may be in the army or in the *posse comitatus* of the county.

I think there is some reason in it. Where shall we put it? I believe we should put it where the laws of Massachusetts put it, in the last resort—in the school-committee. The result would be that the strange anomaly of complainant, prosecutor, judge, and executioner being in one individual, and that individual not controlled by parental instinct, would be obviated.

The last question is, What are you going to do with the incorrigible ones? This is asked as though there were no incorrigibles under the system of corporal punishment. We would do what you would, then, when you can do nothing with them. I will say that those who do wrong will do better for being treated kindly than for being treated harshly.

Some one will say this is all very well in theory, but it will not answer practically. There are but two points to meet such a suggestion. If it is right theoretically, as is agreed, then we only need to have it tried practically by those who honestly desire to see the plan succeed. No harm can come from it, and it may be found that sometimes boys can be treated with as much success by kindness as has been attained in the management of girls by that method. The community will strengthen the hands of every teacher, who by native ability or acquired success infuses a spirit by which this can be accomplished. And when it is accomplished, a new era will dawn on the school history of Massachusetts; and instead of those dark words, "authority, fear, pain," we shall see on the walls of our school-rooms those other words, "gentleness, kindness, love."

*Rev. Mr. Stebbins.* It seems to me it is quite important to have the question so presented that the two parties shall stand in their proper position. The one party throws a degree of ignominy on its opponents that in no way belongs to

them. It is done by using such odious words as "whipping," "flogging," "thrashing," etc. The other side is kept in countenance by saying, "We are going to reform." One is riding a false horse, and the other is in a false position by being obliged to defend what they by no means favor. We have not the necessity of defending whipping, thrashing, etc. Those who would use corporal punishment agree in most that is said on the other side. They all go in earnestly for love and kindness to the greatest extent to which they can be used and made effectual. They moreover maintain that the highest motives that can possibly be used, are to be chosen, and in the order in which they succeed each other. The highest motives which can produce the desired object, without producing a greater evil, are to be chosen. Therefore we have no disagreement. The simple question is, Shall those who are outside of the school, who stand legally above the teacher, by authority say that corporal punishment shall never be used? It is not a question whether we shall seek to lessen corporal punishment by all possible measures, whether we shall hear and attend to every possible measure that can tend to lessen it most. We all go in for that. We all like to hear gentlemen of the medical profession state every fact that can be given to induce caution. We agree that the committee should exercise to the full measure of their authority, the liberty that the law allows to turn out a teacher when he or she shows an unfitness for the place by the improper use of corporal punishment, or any other kind of punishment. When we have done that, we have done the best thing practicable. But when they go further, and say, We put you in as teacher; you are to be wholly responsible for the good order and government of the school, and we are to say just how you are to secure that order; you are to do nothing but what we tell you you may do, even if the schol-

are arrayed against you and you against them,— then the teacher is put into a position in which he has little moral power. He feels it; and the man who will consent to take the position, under such circumstances, it seems to me, is somewhat less than a man. (Applause.)

We have had a great deal of excitement in the City of Springfield on this subject. The occasion was not the whipping of a girl, but of a boy; not by a stout man, but by a feeble woman. The cause was a direct defiance of the teacher's authority, in the presence of the school, and a direct falsification. In the judgment of the teacher, taken in view of the evidence presented, it was her conviction that the boy had falsified. She sent a note to the committee, and asked whether, under those circumstances, she should punish the boy. She had a small raw-hide. She was a feeble woman, her right arm partially paralyzed. She took the raw-hide at the middle so that she might not injure him. At the first blow the boy struck her in her stomach. Then she was obliged to defend herself. But the boy was getting the "upper hand," and she sent for the Principal, and he came down and aided in subduing the boy. The story of that affair was industriously heralded all over the country. People were so excited that when they came to town they would inquire if the boy was dead—he all the while enjoying his recreations. The wrong done to the boy in the school-room, was as nothing in comparison to the wrong done to him as an individual, by the course taken in the community. What we want is to have teachers and the community working in harmony. Every thing that tends to set the parents in one party and the teachers in another, is doing a wrong that cannot be appreciated.



*Rev. Charles Hammond.* There are all sorts of schools of medicine, and of doctors, as there are all sorts of discipline in schools. There is what is called the heroic system of medicine, and there is what is called the homœopathic system; and we have both systems in education. Now, Mr. President, it is one good definition of a quack, to hold to the doctrine that one sort of medicine is good for all sorts of disease, and it is about as good a definition as I have met. Another sign of quackery is to hold to the doctrine that there is one sort of medicine that you never must use, in any case whatever. (Applause.) A physician that has good sense will never be bound by any such kind of doctrine, in my opinion, but will take the case as he finds it; and I believe there are no two cases in medicine exactly alike. Therefore, if a man should say that he never will use a certain medicine, he is in pretty nearly the position of a quack in education.

We were talked to yesterday as though we were not engaged in dealing with flesh and blood. We have to deal with some people who think that any thing in the shape of pain inflicted is prejudicial to our character and influence. It seems to me that this prejudice against teachers has come from a locality where it is taken for granted there is a high refinement, and what is applicable in such a place as Cambridge is to be considered applicable in every locality in the land, from Maine to Texas. There is such a place as Beacon Street in Boston, and such a place as Ann Street. I rather think a different kind of treatment is desirable for the two places. There are cutaneous diseases, and it is necessary to apply remedies for the case. When a person is suffering from pleurisy, it is necessary to put on a counter-irritant that will make the surface blush; and there are things that produce counter-irritation. Is the physician to be considered as desiring to produce pain, because the

patient cries out under the discipline? That person who knows he is dealing with an immortal mind, should have the power to judge in the fear of God, with all his responsibility to the community and to both worlds, and should have power to manage the case himself, just as much as a physician has to manage a case. But this theory, which opposes corporal punishment in the schools, is as much against the good of the schools as that which calls judges cruel.

“No man e’er felt the halter draw,  
With good opinion of the law.”

We have heard to-day that we must have a new word for “authority,” the word “gentleness.” That means no authority. Authority is what must be maintained in our schools and in our land. (Applause.) I think we have had enough to do with appealing to great names, judges, Horace Greeley, Horace Mann, and others, on this subject. I think we had better look at the influence of things, or we shall find that the whole of the Northern community is as much demoralized as the Southern community was in regard to non-coercion, so that the greatest criminal in this land goes undealt with in the way of justice. And the affectionate philosopher, can give bonds for him, knowing that he will never appear, just as he was found cajoling with George Saunders at Montreal. We must understand this at the beginning. The greatest blessing that a teacher can give a child is, to teach him the true nature of authority, and to inspire a healthy fear of consequences if he disobeys. (Applause.)

*Zalmon Richards, Esq., Washington.* For nearly thirty years I have been engaged in the business of teaching. I commenced with the idea that whipping was one of the im-

portant exercises of the school ; one never to be dispensed with. Of course I had occasion to resort to it about as often as I wished. But I have lived, however, to learn one principle, which I think has been lost sight of in the discussion here to-day. What is the object to be gained by punishment ? It took me nearly thirty years to learn that the object is to induce a submission of the will to authority. I have learned that when the child has, in any way submitted himself to authority, the object is gained ; and to gain that, I have found it almost unnecessary to use corporal punishment. I believe that I could govern five hundred boys better now, without corporal punishment, than I could ten when I began to teach, with the system I adopted. And yet I am not ready to say that I would go into any school and proclaim that I was not going to resort to corporal punishment at all. For seven years I did not inflict corporal punishment but twice. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred, if the teacher would be cautious, the boys' will might be subdued without punishment. I have visited two hundred schools in and around Washington within two years, and I have seen lady teachers with a piece of board, going around the room and hitting the pupils a cuff with it. I do not think any one will approve of such government as that.

*Mr. Harrington*, Superintendent of Schools in New Bedford. I was glad to hear the words of the last speaker. This is a subject which goes to the heart of the community. I have noticed demonstrations of applause here which I should think indicated not exactly the right spirit. We need the right spirit. Sarcasm against the spirit of humanity will not crush out the cry for the utmost care, the utmost wisdom, the utmost love, the utmost spirit of God and Christ, in the management of our schools.

The question is upon indorsing, by a resolution, the use of the rod. Many parts of the essay which was read I admire; but the general impression I carried away, is this: Corporal punishment is a necessity in schools, because punishment is one of the penalties adopted by God; it is one of the penalties necessitated by civil government, and it must be carried into the school-room, or you lack one of the grand principles which God employs. I think that an utterly false principle, although I would not by any action of school-committees abolish the possible use of the rod in extraordinary circumstances. Is it not true that the rod should never be employed except as a mere instrument, to lead to something else? If it is adopted as a principle of government, I say that the school that is orderly, under such a dispensation, is under a false rule, and presents a false appearance.

We were told, in the essay, that a teacher who uses corporal punishment is the best judge of its necessity, because he is schooled to its necessity by the very use of it; that those who use it against their desire to inflict bodily pain are noble. Are those who must use corporal punishment, the best judges of its propriety? I think not. Take an extreme case. Do you believe that Torquemada and the authors of the Inquisition were doing the work of God? And do you say that he was improved, and made capable of the nicest discriminations by the exercise of the punishment that he inflicted?

Dr. Wyman took another point, and said he would have those who are not amenable to authority in schools left exactly in the place that they would be without punishment. How often does the rod have an influence? Very seldom: I have case after case in my own experience, of boys — for I never have girls punished; I don't think that a girl over eight years of age has been punished for eight years — who have come to me, who were exposed to corporal punishment;

and I have put them under another teacher, and they now give promise of a noble life. I think now of a boy who had been suspended. He had been punished, and the master said, "I cannot receive him again, unless I give him a good flogging." He was a noble teacher. I let the case lie. After a time I restored the boy and put him in a different room; and at the examination, three weeks ago, that boy was brought forward as the first in his class. O, what a look he had! that boy who had been brought to me over and over again because he could not be controlled. But his self-respect was gained, and he was saved. He will go on steadily now, not because corporal punishment had done him any good, but because it had been laid aside.

Now in regard to the case of the gentleman from New York (Mr. Cruttenden). He is, I know by his looks, one of the men to swear by; I see he is a noble, good fellow. He said he had been whipped over and over again, when a boy; but he would have his fun, and he took the whipping as a matter of course. Ah! when you have brought a school down to that, that scholars take whippings as matters of course, you have a school in which the order is demoralizing in its very self. It is an awful state of things. Now, with all this, I would not have the matter of corporal punishment taken off the books.

*Rev. Mr. Brooks.* I want to give a short description of a Prussian school, and tell how they begin and close. They go on the principle that they are to establish a self-government, which is to take the place of flogging. They say to their children, Here we are, a hundred of us, girls and boys; we wish to learn the most we can in the shortest time and with the least suffering to you children. Now, what shall we do? They say, Let us have a school conscience, let us create

in this school a conscience which is to do all the government of it. The way is this. If a child has committed some misdemeanor, what do they do with him? They present the case of this child to the school as to a jury. They ask the scholars, Will any one of you be the defender of this child? One will say, I will. Will any of you be the accuser? And one will say, I will. They try the case before the school, and every child is obliged to give his opinion when the case is given to them by the master, who sums up the whole. The consequence is that the discussion is often a long one; and they think that discussion is one of the best means of developing the human mind. They teach grammar by it, and they fix the laws for the government of the school by discussion. They thereby implant conscience, as a rule of life, in these young minds, so that it will take effect under all the circumstances of human trial.

Over the door of the normal school, you see the words, "*Pray and work;*" first pray, and then work. If the boy who has been arraigned, is brought in guilty by the school, then how far? Shall he be deprived of so many merits, or deprived of so many amusements in which the others are indulged? By this system they so create a government of the school, separated from the head of the school. That government I believe can be implanted in every school on earth, and when it is done, the necessity for these cruel floggings will be overcome.

*H. H. Lincoln, Esq.* With regard to the words "whipping" and "flogging," I never use them in my school. I do not believe in them. Twenty-five years ago, when I took charge of a school, I used only the word "punishment." You might as well say that, when a surgeon takes his knife and performs an operation, he stabs his patient. It is a misnomer to talk



of whipping so much. You might as well call the knife of the surgeon the dagger of an assassin.

The Superintendent of Schools in New Bedford (Mr. Harrington) stands exactly where I do. He believes that power should rest in the hands of the teacher. No man living would do away with corporal punishment sooner than I; but if the question comes up, whether my pupils or I shall govern the school, then, come weal or wo, I will conquer. "I would not bend the knee to kiss the ground beneath young Malcolm's feet, though Birnam Wood should come to Dunsinane." School-committees may remove teachers; they may exercise that power if they do not govern their schools judiciously. But pupils have no rights in this direction. Several teachers in my school during the past year have failed in discipline, and been obliged to leave. Their scholars have conquered them. All teachers, I think, should form a fixed and unalterable determination to succeed in discipline at all hazards. They should have the spirit to say, "Committees may turn me out; but my pupils never."

I contend that teachers are the best judges whether punishment is necessary in a school or not. And if you tell me they are not, where will you find men that deserve the name, to take charge of your schools? What did General Grant say, when he took charge of the Army of the Potomac?—"Let me alone, and I will do your work." Those who had commanded the army before were controlled by men outside. Can a man outside of my school tell whether a boy deserves punishment or not? I take it, not. With our present organization, there is a necessity for the use of force in our schools.

One gentleman, yesterday, said I introduced nothing of a progressive nature into the paper I presented. I think I introduced progressive ideas. I stated that if a proper home

government could be instituted in every family in the State, the evil of which so many complain would die a natural death. Is there nothing progressive in that? There was but one other step which I could have taken, and that was to bury the monster!

Again: Did I not say, in that paper, that we should so govern our pupils, we should continue our force and action upon them so long that they shall have learned that best of all discipline, self-discipline? Is there nothing progressive in that idea? If we can teach them to govern themselves will they not progress? My ideal is always ahead of my actual: always has been and always will be; not only in this life, but in the eternity that is to come.

Again: Did I not say that we should sit humbly and reverently at the feet of our Great Teacher and learn of Him?—Is there nothing progressive in that idea? Have we exhausted Christ or His truth, or can we? Not in this world. To be sure I did not say, nor do I say now, that I believe corporal punishment can be abolished next year, or the next after, or at any future time. I cannot give an intelligent opinion upon that point. I act to-day, to the best of my light and knowledge. I look to my experience in the past, to my inspiration in the present, to my hopes for the future, for my guidance. I cannot tell what I shall believe a year from the present time; I desire to “act in the living present, heart within, and God o’erhead.” I believe that truth is eternal; but with the poet, that “Its essence with endless change is fitted to the hour.”

*Hon. Victor M. Rice*, Superintendent of Public Instruction in the State of New York. I have listened with much interest to this discussion. In a city in our State, ten years ago, in which there were fifteen thousand children of all classes,

there was a superintendent elected who did not believe a man was a quack because he was in favor of corporal punishment, or because he did not believe in it; but he did believe that some men were so ingenious that they could do things which other men less ingenious could not do. He determined that he would have no corporal punishment in the schools. So he went around among the children and told them he expected they would be good and honorable, and that it would not be necessary to punish them. He talked over the matter with the teachers; and they all agreed to try. The superintendent went to the printer's and got 25,000 cards with the word "*Good*" upon them; and 10,000 with the word "*Honor*." He took these cards and distributed them among the teachers. He divided the pupils of the schools also into different rows, calling one the "Washington Row," another the "Jefferson Row," etc., and talked about the character of the individuals whose names the rows bore, so that the boys might imitate them. The girls had a "Martha Washington Row," and a "Sigourney Row," etc. Each seat or row had a committee appointed. He believed in the doctrine of self-control, that when a child can control himself in one thing he has more power to do it in another; that each day of self-control increases his strength. In those schools, a child who passed through the week, having done well, received a card, and was charged to take it home to be preserved till the close of the term,—in the lower department receiving the card with the word "good;" and in the higher classes, one with the word "honor."

It was found, at first, that about one fourth of the children were entitled to cards, and had learned to control themselves well for that time. The next week, the number increased. At first, some of the boys who had no control at home, shook their heads at the system; but gradually it worked upon

them, and in three months nearly every one received cards to take home.

The result was that there were only two cases of corporal punishment during the year, out of the whole fifteen thousand children. The worst boys we had were taught to believe that the teachers relied upon them, and that they had good hearts; and by particular attention to them they arrived at the position of self-control by which they became as good as those taught at home by better parents. I know hundreds, who were ragged children, without instruction at home, who, through that course of attention on the part of their teachers, are men of influence and power in the State to-day.

My position is this. If you can prove that corporal punishment is actually necessary, that virtue, goodness and kindness cannot control, then resort to it.

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

##### DISCUSSION RESUMED.

The subject of School Discipline, which was under consideration at the adjournment in the forenoon, was taken up again at the opening of the afternoon session.

*George M. Gage, Esq.*, Principal of the Normal School at Farmington, Maine. For myself, I do not wish to stand in any equivocal position on a matter of such vital importance as this. I have an opinion, and I wish to state that opinion fairly and candidly, and I do not wish to have it distorted at all. I believe that in nine tenths of the cases where physical force is resorted to, for the purpose of school discipline, it is abused. I believe that appeals should be made to the better, the truer, the higher nature first. But I differ with some of

my friends, I think, on this great question of progress. I believe there are certain eternal truths, beyond which men do not progress. I believe that the truths of inspiration are those which will stand and endure, and which, as men of the nineteenth century, we are not passed away from. When I read, "first pure, then peaceable," I understand, *first* pure; and when He who is my master made a scourge of small cords and went in and drove them out of the temple, I think that I, with my poor, finite ability, my poor knowledge of human nature, cannot hope to do better than my Saviour did. These are my plain sentiments in regard to it, and I do not believe we have yet progressed away from the eternal truths where we must stand.

Those cases where schools have been successful without the use of the rod will be found to have been managed by mere temporary expedients. After a while the master goes away. Look into it, and it will be found, probably, that he saw breakers ahead. The resort to physical force should not be made till every other measure has been tried.

*Mr. Richards.* I wish to know whether the Saviour used the scourge to drive out the men, or the cattle and sheep.

*Mr. Gage.* I understand that it was the money-changers.

The further discussion was then suspended.

#### READING — STYLES AND METHODS.

The subject of "*Reading — Styles and Methods*," was then taken up, as next in order.

*Mr. Richards* opened the subject in a paper prepared by him, evincing careful study, and giving some of the results of his long experience, which will be found in another part of the volume.

#### EXHIBITION BY DR. LEIGH.

An exhibition was given by Dr. Edwin Leigh, to illustrate his method of teaching children to read from books printed in what he denominates "pronouncing type." Specimens of the characters employed were also shown, and of words printed in them. Three of the children — girls of about six years of age — from the public schools of Boston, in some of which books in the new type are used, gave great satisfaction in the evidence exhibited of the success of the method adopted in their training. There was also a large class from the "Home for Little Wanderers," who had been trained only in the letters and analysis of sounds, and in spelling by the new method, for two weeks. They showed great interest in the exercise themselves, and very marked proficiency. The girls from the Home sang two pieces with fine effect.

*Prof. Leonard*, of Boston, gave some illustrations of his ideas in regard to reading, by several examples from Shakspeare and E. A. Poe.

#### DISCUSSION ON DISCIPLINE RESUMED.

On motion of Mr. Wheeler, of Cambridge, the subject of reading was then laid on the table, and the discussion upon discipline was resumed.



*Mr. Crosby*, of Nashua, inquired if *Mr. Allen*, of Newton, in discussing this subject, had said, as he was understood to say, that God never corrected a moral offence by physical discipline.

*Mr. Allen*. I made no such statement. I distinctly stated that the Almighty does punish ; but, for moral delinquencies, by moral methods, and, for physical transgressions, by physical pain. I do not know whether I shall submit to be questioned, but, out of respect to the gentleman's age, I will listen to him.

*The President*. The question is a theological one, and is not in order.

*Mr. Crosby*. Was it in order for him to say that the Lord never punishes physically for moral transgression ?

*The President*. That is a question that he must answer to the Lord for. (Applause.)

*Mr. Crosby*. I refer to the same authority for asking the question. I would ask whether he considers lying a moral or a physical sin ?

*The President*. The question is not one pertaining to the subject under discussion.

*Mr. Crosby*. Then I take it up. I recollect that I read in a good book, that two individuals were struck dead for committing that sin ; and I recollect that persons were punished for making false gods. I think three thousand were slain at one time for that. If the ideas held out by certain individuals

prevail, and the time ever comes when authority is taken from the teachers, I wish to remark that I believe the people will be obliged to be punished for worshipping a calf made of far baser material than gold.

*Mr. Waterman*, of Newton, said that, although the subject of corporal punishment had been discussed at great length, no man had given a definition of what it was, and many teachers were in the habit of saying that they had never struck a blow, when he knew that they were accustomed to shake, pinch, and trip their scholars up, and use other means that they did not consider corporal punishment. He believed that the sense of ninety-nine one-hundredths of the members of the association was that the teacher should have the power to use the rod, but that he should exhaust every other means before its employment. He wanted some resolution adopted which should say that the Institute favored its use only in extreme cases, and at the same time retain the power in the hands of the teacher. If the association did not vote in this way he was afraid it would get abroad that they had indorsed the brutal and promiscuous use of the rod, and it would be unjust to them. He therefore moved that the resolution indorsing *Mr. Lincoln's* paper be referred to a committee of three, who should report a resolution to be acted upon at some future time. He believed in whipping, but he did not believe in having it every day, or every month.

The resolution was then read, and the action of the Institute was taken upon the first part, adopting it, and thanking *Mr. Lincoln* unanimously for his able paper; and the latter part, fully indorsing the views expressed in the paper, was further considered.

*T. W. Valentine, Esq.*, of New York. I do not rise to make a speech, but to throw out a few thoughts which have occurred to me while listening to the discussion yesterday and to-day. I supposed that this whole question was settled twenty years ago, and I thought I was one of the survivors of that battle, or one of the slain, and I hoped it was never to come up again. I thought it was settled among all sensible men, that force was undesirable, but that we must have it sometimes. That is the conclusion I thought some men had come to; it is that to which I know we had converted Mr. Randall, of New York. But you "Wise Men of the East," who are always getting up some new thing, have got this matter up again.

I am glad the facts have been brought out by this discussion as to the reports we have seen in the papers. Mr. Valentine said there seemed to be a growing impatience among the community in regard to all restraint; he found it so everywhere. Why was it? It was the tendency somehow or other to let everybody do just as they were a mind to. It was not only so in schools, but in churches. No church now carried out a rigid discipline in relation to the conduct of its members. It was claimed by some that we were making progress; we might be, but it was in the wrong direction. He considered that this question of corporal punishment was a theological one. As our views in theology, so were our views on this question. Upon the principle inculcated in God's word, he would stand eternally, even if he stood alone. (Applause.) He believed that there were schools where the use of force was necessary. He was opposed to Mr. Waterman's amendment, because he believed that the views presented in Mr. Lincoln's paper were correct, just, and moderate, and could not be improved.

*Dr. Lambert*, of New York. I think a slight change in the wording of the resolution might make it better, that is, "we who vote in the affirmative." I am reminded of a Dutch Justice who was very anxious to hay his broom corn, out in the Mohawk Valley. He was very much fretted by having a case come before him, for the weather was such that he wanted to be in the field with the boys. The lawyers insisted that the case should come on. After trying it by receiving the testimony, the Justice said, "I want to go and help hay the broom corn, and I will let you lawyers settle the question, and when you are through, call me and I will come and decide it." I know this question was discussed twenty years ago, but this and other questions will be talked of for years to come. And if we just pass this resolution by adding the words which I have suggested, I think it will meet the approbation of all.

A single word with regard to my own children. I say you are at liberty to punish my child in any way you think fit, if you don't go beyond prudence. I expect you to act prudently, and if I thought you would not, I would not place my child with you. I know by my own experience that I was benefited by such treatment, and I think what was good for the father will be good for his boy.

A mother once asked me, "Do you think a child is in danger of dying, when, in a fit of anger, it throws itself upon the floor and holds its breath?" And she wanted to know what to do to cure it. I told her I had never known a case of a child dying in that way; but I told her there was an important connection between the skin and the nerves of respiratory action, and that if she would make a proper application to the surface, I thought the breath would come back again. (Laughter.)

*A. P. Stone, Esq.*, of Portland, Maine. I do not think the question is fully settled, or ever will be, so long as we have boys and girls in the schools. But we shall be in a false attitude if we attempt to incorporate our views in a resolution like that. I indorse that paper of Mr. Lincoln. What more do we need than the resolution which we have already passed, in regard to it. We are too often passing resolutions; and if we get to heaven I have sometimes thought we shall get together and pass resolutions about Gabriel or some one else. I think it will be wrong to indorse any thing by a resolution.

Look at the case in Cambridge, of a girl who undoubtedly needed to be punished. It never appeared that she was cruelly punished. A distinguished gentleman was trotted out and made to say that he had taught school forty years, and never struck a pupil. But he never had taught such schools as we do. And then an ex-governor was made to say something like the same thing, who never, probably, taught such schools as we have to govern. I have never known people make such fools of themselves as those people in Cambridge did, because they attempted to do what never should be done. I know that many of them are heartily ashamed of it.

There may be some persons who should be sent to Botany Bay. There was a doctor hung in Boston, a few years ago; but it does not follow that all doctors should be hung. We all wish that we might never be compelled to use the rod. I do not use it, and I hope I shall not. But the simple question is, What are we to gain by referring this to a committee, or by passing a resolution? You cannot make it indorse our views wholly. The benefit of this discussion is in the discussion itself. It is not the decision that we are to reach for the purpose of influencing the community. It is the wavering teachers — for some are wavering — who will be strengthened and set

right. I hope this matter will be indefinitely postponed after gentlemen have said what they wish, and that no resolution will be passed, in attempting to say what will do no good.

*A. G. Boyden, Esq.*, Principal of the Normal School at Bridgewater. I wish to speak to the main question, because I think every teacher ought to define his position. It is an important question as I regard it; and when men prominent in official stations or in the walks of science come forward and say to us, teachers, that we are not to use force as a motive to lead scholars to good conduct, I say it is time for us to protest, in some proper way, against having our hands tied. My conviction has been that we must, at times, use force. I have acted on that principle. I am in a position in which I am obliged to think on the subject. I have under my charge young men and young women, who are preparing to go out as teachers; and they ask me definitely, "What shall I do — shall I use the rod or not?" They hear an ex-governor of Massachusetts, and others, say the time has come for its abolition. Now they ask, "Shall we dispense with it or not?" It is not a question of opinion, but one of practice.

Is the use of force a right or a wrong principle to appeal to? I say, unhesitatingly, it is right. We have it in the family, in the State, and in the nation. How are we to get along without it? Is not human nature the same in the school-room that it is in the street or in the family? Suppose whipping has been abolished in the army and in the navy; what has that to do with the question of school discipline? The whipping of a man is one thing, and that of a refractory boy is another. We have children who are rebellious. When the teacher makes a reasonable requirement of a scholar, which is to yield? Shall the teacher submit? That is just the shape the question takes. There are cases when the question must



be met right on the spot, without hesitation and dallying. I contend that when these emergencies come, it is right for the teacher to use corporal punishment, if he think that is the best thing.

If I am right, I wish to know it; if not, I wish to be set right. I ask those gentlemen who say that teachers who exercise corporal punishment are infamous, — taking human nature as it is, and our schools just as they are, — to give us a substitute. I have never heard a man, who says corporal punishment is a relic of the dark ages, offer a substitute.

The eminent gentleman from Cambridge spoke well on the subject this morning. I do not believe in whipping girls; or if so, the necessity must be very rare. But what are we to have instead of it. What will the young man or the young woman do? Here are forty or fifty scholars of all ages, and here is this young teacher called to teach them; and how is it to be done? You cannot make a beginning in that direction, unless there is, on the part of the pupils, a prompt, willing obedience. How is that to be secured? Sometimes by force. I do not mean that force is to be used indiscriminately, but judiciously. I think the question should be left to the judgment of a successful teacher; and if our teachers are not successful, then elect those who are so. But if parents use it, and if city and state governments use it to govern the people, why, and on what ground, I ask, are teachers required to dispense with it? I hear men say it is brutal to strike a boy: I have heard it by men, who, in speaking of the battle of Bull-Run, said they were ready to fight a hundred such battles, to whip the rebels into obedience.

I indorse every sentiment of the paper of Mr. Lincoln. I think it was able, eloquent, truthful, and just. I think it is what we need. I am tired of this sickly sentimentalism, which is sweeping through the community.

I remember the discussion on this question many years ago, and I recollect that I had this view in regard to teaching. I thought, as I heard many prominent men speak, that the boys and girls were angels, and only wanted wings to mount up and join the cherubim; although I knew, in my father's family, where there were half a dozen, that I, the eldest, had to be whipped, and that the next one did; and I saw it had a good effect. I remember the younger one, playing with the bellows one morning, would not come to breakfast when father called him. He said he was not ready, and my father used moral suasion for some time; but, finally, he gave him a sound whipping, before the family, sisters and all; and I don't believe they loved the father or mother any the less. It did them good, and saved them from several whippings. My brother got the question of obedience to authority well settled then for him, though it was not for me, for I had to be punished in school.

When the question of obedience to rightful authority, judiciously administered, comes, and when the child—boy or girl, I don't care which—rebels, conquer. I have more fear that my boy will not learn the lesson of obedience to God and to law thoroughly, than that he will be injured by corporal punishment. I speak as a father; and I believe it is time for us to assert ourselves, and stand by principles that are right. So long as "foolishness is bound up in the heart of a child," I believe it will be necessary to whip it out of him. I do not believe the time will ever come, in this world, until we have something besides this present conflict between good and evil, that it will not be necessary.

*Mr. Richards*, of Washington, asked leave to introduce another resolution,—that we do not consider it safe or wise for the State to abolish corporal punishment.

*Rev. Mr. Stebbins* offered the following resolution as a substitute for the one proposed by Mr. Strong.

*Resolved*, That while we believe the best methods of school discipline are those which involve the most kindness and least severity, provided they answer the true ends of government, we still believe that the interests of our schools would be sacrificed, rather than promoted, by legislative restrictions in regard to methods of discipline.

*Mr. Stebbins.* I offer this resolution as a substitute, for this reason. While I say most heartily, that from the beginning to the end of that address of Mr. Lincoln, I followed it with my entire approval, as far as I understand it; yet, when we are sending forth something to the community, approving of something, and stating it in the words "physical force," leaving the community to infer in what way physical force is to be employed, we expose ourselves to much disadvantage and misrepresentation. If the resolution of approval and the address could go out together, I should most heartily vote for it. I hope we shall show our approval of the address by voting to print and send it out to the public.

*Mr. Stone, of Woburn.* I am one of the few who are not in favor of indorsing the paper of yesterday, though I do not know that there is anything in it to which I cannot agree. We owe it to ourselves that we speak out our sentiments, as we do in our political gatherings. As we have political platforms, I think it is time for us to have a platform of our own, on which we can stand and speak our sentiments, and let them go out to the country in regard to this subject. I heartily concur in the sentiments uttered by most of the gentlemen this afternoon.

*The President.* If there is any one who does not believe in corporal punishment, we would like to hear from him before this discussion closes.

*Dr. Ordway, of Boston.* I wish to say one thing in addition to what I said yesterday. I am surprised that a body of gentlemen and ladies, representing the educational ability of our State and other States, should come here and indorse the sentiments expressed in the paper given yesterday, — indorse sentiments which are as far behind this age as light is ahead of darkness. I have more chance to look into this matter than teachers who are confined to one locality. Let teachers go around and see the different styles of teaching, and they would not come to these results.

The gentleman (Mr. Lincoln) had much to say yesterday about rebels. I was one who went to the war, and went from the love of it. That is the way that children should be taught. I should like to have that address published, for I think it is one of the lamest I have ever listened to. The history of the age is against corporal punishment. Every teacher who gets along without corporal punishment is most successful. The time will come when corporal punishment will be abolished. Why? The parent who does not use it, expects it will not be used in school. The parent who believes in using love and kindness, does not desire that the teacher should use corporal punishment in the school. Children are treated too much like criminals. I maintain that there is not one teacher in fifty who studies the peculiar character and constitution of the child under him. There are children with the premonitory symptoms of juvenile disease, and they cannot study.

A merchant, who went to the Eliot School when a boy, told me that at the age of twelve he was whipped because he

could not learn writing. He was of a nervous temperament, and, until he was twenty-two years of age, it was impossible for him to learn to write his name so that it could be read.

In one year there were 43,133 cases of corporal punishment in the Boston schools; and, in making inquiries, it was found that while in one school there were thousands of cases, in others there were from five to six hundred, and in one, less than a hundred.

In every case of truancy, in my opinion, the fault is with the teacher. This may seem radical, but I believe it. And I furthermore believe that the day is coming when this barbarous practice of corporal punishment will be abolished.

*Mr. Stone*, of Portland. Notwithstanding I objected to the reference to the committee, I will vote for the substitute offered by *Mr. Stebbins*. But I protest against gentlemen, I don't care what professional title they may have received, getting up here and saying that we, teachers, treat our pupils as criminals. I have a right to do it, after twenty years' experience; and I am ready to compare figures with the gentleman from Boston; and if I cannot prove that I have visited as many and as many different kinds of schools as he has, then I will acknowledge my error. The gentleman may be surprised to have this body indorse that paper. I am surprised to hear a gentleman indorse doctrines as far from the truth as doubly diluted moonshine is from the clear light of the sun at noonday. If the gentleman is morbid, let him examine himself, but not persist in saying that teachers treat their pupils as criminals.

*Dr. Ordway*. What I said yesterday was, that as *Mr. Lincoln* said there should be a Botany Bay for some scholars,

I replied that I thought there should be a Botany Bay for some teachers.

*Mr. Palmer*, of Winchester. I am but a layman in the cause of education now; but I am so recently from the field, that my sympathies are yet with teachers. I have paid the utmost attention to the discussion; and I have been utterly astounded at some of the remarks, and at none more than those made by the gentleman from Boston (*Dr. Ordway*) yesterday. He said that three fourths of the teachers were not competent to fill their places. If that be so, I thank Heaven that I am not one of them. I listened attentively to the paper read by *Mr. Lincoln*, and I could adopt every word. I hope action will be taken upon the original resolution. We should do what we do, not in a doubtful manner; and let those not directly interested in the schools know where we stand. If we go down, let us go.

*Mr. A. J. Phipps*, of Medford, thought that if the paper of *Mr. Lincoln* could go out with the resolutions originally offered, there would be no objection to it. He indorsed the views presented, but he would prefer something more definite than the original resolutions.

*T. D. Adams, Esq.*, of Newton, wished to adopt the second resolution. He then called up *Dr. Ordway*, by inquiring whether he had ever taught school a day in his life.

*Dr. Ordway*, in reply, said: I have not taught school; but for many years, in Boston, I taught one branch of study, and I found the same motive might apply there as in schools. I taught music. I never saw any motive equal to that of teaching children to love the art.



*Mr. Stone*, of Woburn. I taught school sixteen years and never struck a blow, and yet I go for the resolution. I did not succeed so well the seventeenth year.

*Mr. Adams*. I claim that I have an advantage over the Doctor from Boston. I sung myself through college, and taught school at the same time. I, as well as he, would be one of the last to try to whip music into a child. But I have seen occasions when certain other things were attained by the use of the rod, that could not have been attained in any other way. I have taught school about twenty years, in all sorts of schools, and my experience, if it is worth anything, embraces more than that of the Doctor. I have no doubt that a large majority here indorse the sentiments of the paper, every word of it; and if so, we should express our opinions for the future safety of these teachers.

*Mr. Allen*, of Newton. I prefer the latter resolution to the former one. I believe that though there is not a majority against the resolution, yet there is a large minority. And as there are many who do not agree to either resolutions, I hope they will be indefinitely postponed.

*Mr. Bulkley*, of Brooklyn, called for the previous question, and it was ordered.

*The President* ruled that the substitute was first in order, and the question being taken upon its adoption, it was adopted by a large majority; and under the ruling of the President, this closed the discussion.

## EVENING SESSION.

At the opening of the session this evening, *Rev. Mr. Duncan*, from Florida, was called upon, and he responded by making a brief statement of the condition of things in that State. They have established schools generally for the negroes; but the whites have no system of public schools. The colored and white people are getting along in "sweet harmony."

*Rev. Mr. Ware* spoke of the work of education among the freedmen in Georgia, where he had been teaching. They are trying to wipe out the question of color in Georgia, in respect to schools.

A memorial address was then delivered by *Elbridge Smith, Esq.*, of Dorchester, Mass., which will be found in another part of the volume.

## THIRD DAY.

## FRIDAY MORNING SESSION.

The Institute was called to order at nine o'clock. Prayer was offered by Rev. A. A. Miner, D. D., President of Tufts College.

## DISCUSSION.

The first matter in the order of discussion this morning was, "*Right-mindedness favorable to Intellectual Growth.*"

Agreeably to arrangement, Dr. Miner was present, and opened the discussion upon this question, in a very able address. His remarks will be found in another part of the volume.

*Rev. Mr. Stebbins.* It is with a great deal of pleasure that I have listened to the presentation of this subject before us this morning. It seems a very happy supplement to the subject, which is also important, which has been discussed at length by us. It is a subject that I believe needs to be presented often and with great earnestness and force to the community generally; and nowhere is it more important than in a gathering of teachers. There is a depth to this subject that is greater than it is possible for us to exhaust. We are apt to float over the surface of it, ordinarily. If there be one law in our nature which it is important to observe, and without the observance of which we cannot even begin right, much less proceed right, it is the law of the condition that we recognize when we say every human being has been created

as a subject of divine law, from which it is utterly impossible for him to depart without going astray from the grand and high object for which he was created. When we adopt the theory which is sometimes adopted and asserted with a great deal of positiveness, that it is the business of the public schools to attend to the intellectual training of the pupils only, I believe we have made an assertion which is totally fatal to the realization of the object of the public schools.

The public school, more than others, should be comprehensive in its aims; it should feel bound to attend to the character of the pupil, and seek to develop the highest possible human results out of each individual subject of the public school. For the very assumption is, that the State has a right to the best results to each individual member of the public schools; and that is, that each shall become a citizen of a high character, and noble and generous aims, who goes forth in the best possible condition to enter upon the grand work of doing good to the world. This cannot be realized unless we recognize that man is the subject of law; not simply of physical or intellectual law; not merely moral law; but law in its fullest sense; that which takes in every possible element and condition of the human structure and organization, and that embraces the religious also. Now, those who do most to bring their pupils in early life to recognize this condition heartily, certainly do the best thing possible for the scholars.

In the beginning, one of the most important things for the pupil to recognize is, that he is to be a humble student, searching for truth for its own sake, and most earnestly for that truth which is most valuable. It is utterly impossible for us to tell beforehand, I think, what truth is most plausible, or what system of truth is most plausible. If I recognize the one great fact, that I am a subject of the Creator, that He

has made me under certain conditions, and for certain ends, then I am prepared to recognize the fact that I am not qualified to mark out my course in regard to the great ends for which I was created. And especially am I unqualified to judge that in the very beginning of my learning. The student should be made to know and feel that if he would hope to know what the conditions of his being are, he must sit as a humble disciple in the school of revelation. God, who has made him under certain conditions, and for certain aims, has not left him without the means of knowing what those conditions and aims are, nor where it is impracticable to know what he most of all needs to know. The simple condition is that he recognizes his inability to learn, of himself, and that he may learn of Him whose child he is.

Cultivate an implicit faith, in the beginning, in the authority of the divine teachings, and cultivate a disposition to take cordially the teachings of God, whether learned in the great school of nature and science, or in the revealed word of God. Let him take these as he would accept the teachings of a parent, or the teachings of an instructor in whom he has the most perfect confidence; then he is in a condition which comes the nearest to right-mindedness of any that I am able to conceive or express.

I most heartily accord with the views which have been presented with regard to the importance of the motives which we bring to bear upon pupils. I deprecate, in common with the speaker, the presentation of the motive of gaining superiority for its own sake. Nothing can be more cultivative of selfishness,—pure, unadulterated selfishness, than that. How small the motive; how degrading in itself! It operates in a twofold way. If the pupil is aiming only at superiority, then the means employed are of little consequence. If the pupil who stands in the way, can be

brought down below his own present level, without any rise on his own part, his object is attained, and it is done more easily, it may be, than if, while the other pupil is continually rising, he is compelled to put forth his own energies with greater intensity to outstrip him. Therefore, he is likely to congratulate himself over anything that makes the attainment of his own object any easier. And when it is done, what has been done for the successful person? Is he any more of a symmetrical man? Is he more likely to go forth to bless the world by his own benefactions and efforts? Is not the contrary more likely to be true? Success in acquisition of what is worthy, may be held before a pupil. Sometimes a prize may be held up, indirectly; but we should be careful not to be the occasion of a damage which far outweighs the highest possible good. We should do everything that we can do to cultivate generous feelings; everything we can do to make pupils rejoice in the success of every other pupil; feeling that what the world wants is the largest amount of desirable knowledge, the largest amount of excellent character, and the largest amount of good motives and aims. If we can lead the pupil to rejoice in the attainments of any scholar who contributes to the treasury of the world,—lead him to rejoice in that, and because of that,—then we may be sure that scholar is being educated into a truer manhood, or a truer womanhood. And those schools in which these feelings prevail, are the best gardens for the cultivation of the intellect and character which it is possible to form. To be instrumental in any degree in the cultivation of such a garden, is more valuable than any thing else. It is one in which we may be well content to labor on, even though for the present the labor carries with it but little appreciation.



*Albert Tolman, Esq.*, of Lanesborough. We want to make this discussion practical, that it may guide us in our plans. These two motives, emulation and an overpowering spirit of fear, I will refer to briefly. "Know ye not, that they who run in a race, run all; but one receives the prize?" Paul refers to the Grecian games, in which one received the prize. He adds, "*but one!*" I always say to my scholars, "There is a chance for every one of you to win a prize worth winning." I have thought the best way of removing the evil of emulation was to give prizes to all, as in colleges, where they give diplomas. I notice that, in Amherst College, for the last two or three commencements, in the list of speakers, they are marked with a certain grade. It is not levelling downwards, in order to promote one's self. It may be said by this plan, "Get to the valedictory grade if you can; no matter how many others may do the same thing." The same practice is adopted in Boston. If medals are given to all who reach a certain grade, it will prevent that selfishness which seeks to elevate itself at the expense of others. There should be, not one medal for a large school, but a medal grade, to which all may attain.

In regard to the motive of fear, to bring the matter down to an illustration, I remember that I was for three years under the control of one teacher, and I never could get the influence of fear out of my mind. I never went to him to ask a question; I was always afraid; and I never have had my soul so much stirred as when I look back to the exercises of that school. Here was a little boy, weak in mind, over whom the master stood, with a rattan, compelling him to write. I remember a large seminary, not more than a thousand miles distant, where the best of the students were always overpowered by fear. I think such a school is a failure. I think it is a perversion of teaching, when those

who are disposed to do well cannot get over that overwhelming fear. If we cannot produce the right state of feeling in a large majority of the school, without force, that school is a failure.

*Mr. Capen*, of South Boston, thought the subject a very comprehensive one; that we should look upon this life as a theatre for souls; that no mind can attain its best condition without a reference to its future destiny. To be right-minded, we should be whole-minded, and it should be the end of education to develop every faculty of man to the highest degree.

*Dr. Barrows*, of South Berwick, Maine. I wish to say a word or two on a subject which interests me very much, because it is practical with me: it is the matter of prizes. It embarrasses me very much. We have gold medals and prize books. It seems to me that prizes may be of two kinds,—first, a mere recognition of scholarship; and second, those which have an intrinsic money value. Whatever we may say of valedictory prizes, it seems to me that prizes which have a money value are injurious, and only injurious. If there is but one such prize, it is but a very slight incitement to the school generally. We should aim to improve the whole school, and not two or three of the best scholars. Only two or three will contend for the prize. I find, in my school, it is impossible for me to do justice to the scholars. I never hesitate to say to the scholars that I cannot. As a trustee, *ex-officio*, I am to take one stand, and, in justice to myself, I take another. But when the scholars come to me, in friendship, I never say "prize" to a scholar, and I should not know how to teach if I did. If I cannot interest my scholars in science itself, I cannot succeed as a teacher. \*

There is a fund connected with our institution for the giving of prize books, and the whole burden comes on me; and whether I wish to give prizes or not, there will be scholars offended, and it cannot be helped. It is impossible either to do justice, or to give those prizes acceptably; for even though the scholar who gains the prize is popular, there is always a feeling back of that, even if the pupils do not speak of it, and it injures the school. I wish for the affection of every scholar, and not of two or three of the best; and it is a great embarrassment in my future teaching that I have necessarily offended two or three scholars.

I do not believe a prize should be given on simple abstract scholarship. Health is an important element in scholarship. One may labor as much as another, but the physical health of one may prevent obtaining the prize of scholarship. I have scholars, whom I, as a physician, forbid to study more than so much. Suppose such a scholar happens to be ambitious, I must advise him not to study for the prize, or he will injure his health for life.

I do not believe that the teachers suggest these prizes. How many are there here who have had practical experience and know what is best, who approve of these prizes? Is it not true that benevolent gentlemen, who do not know the evil, offer these prizes, and there is not ability on the part of trustees to resist the offer, because the funds are wanted? If a fund is offered, which would be an injury to the school, it is my duty to refuse it.

As to fear, it seems to me that some gentlemen have taken the position that love and fear together are incompatible. Suppose I wish to gain the love and confidence of my pupils, — and I confess this is my first desire, — I join in their sports. Suppose I show them all this, and I have an ugly fellow, who knows it is my practice to use love only, what will he

say? Is it not necessary to have the principle of fear back of that, so that he may know if he does not love, he must fear the teacher, or that the teacher may have the power of controlling him. If we cannot combine the two, I think that, in some respects, we fail as educators.

*Isaac F. Cady, Esq.*, of Rhode Island. I want to thank the gentlemen, who have spoken, for the excellent words and for the noble and correct views which they have presented. There is one single thought which I am disposed to utter. It has struck me while listening, that almost the *summum bonum* is right-mindedness in the teacher. There have been continued failures, because right-mindedness has not been acted out by teachers. If teachers had always been right-minded in the use of the means of discipline, I doubt whether there would have been so much necessity for discussion on the subject of discipline. I would rather have the rod used than the cutting language of some teachers. The latter is a more damaging thing than the former, in my opinion. I would scarcely like to say that the rod should never be used; but right-mindedness always tries to be clear, and seeks to bring the scholars up to the true standard, the teacher placing a high model for himself, and striving, by all noble, generous motives, to raise his pupils at the same time. Such a teacher, it seems to me, is in the right way.

*Mr. Chase*, of Watertown. I wish to say to my fellow-teachers that I have been exceedingly interested in the discussion this morning, commencing with the first address. Having taken some interest, although not on account of similarity of theological views, in the institution with which the first gentleman who addressed us is connected, I believe

he has succeeded in impressing that state of right-mindedness on the students in that institution.

The object of this discussion, it seems to me, should be twofold. First, that there should be such a comprehensive view taken as has been taken, by a gentleman competent to do it; and then that these individual points should be brought out by us as teachers. Sometimes our young teachers endeavor to carry away principles at wholesale.

I would call attention to but two points. The first is the subject of rewards. I will give a fact. Connected with my school, I will not say where, there was a pupil, a young lady of fourteen years of age. A gentleman came about offering Bibles to the individual who would commit the greatest number of verses of the Bible to memory. In our sabbath-school that work commenced, and the scholars became more and more stimulated; and one day this young lady recited to her sabbath-school teacher one thousand verses of the Bible. It made her almost an insane person to this day. It produced such a state of the nervous system, that she was agitated continually, and she has never entered my school since. This fact is enough.

But how shall we excite emulation? My own course is a little peculiar. My classes are formed, and we go along from day to day, and from month to month. I notice some pupil is getting in advance, I call the attention of the school to the fact; at the same time, I say to her, "Mary, you may read in such a place;" so as to show to the school her qualifications; and when the school is made to see the propriety of the measure, I say, "Mary, you may go to the next higher class." I never say beforehand who is likely to get that reward; and as they do not know when they are likely to be promoted, the course has a good effect.

How shall we punish pupils, and secure order, and not ex-

cite hatred. I believe it may be done in the same way that God does it; that is by showing justice. If a teacher departs from justice, he loses his control. Let him show that he is just towards every scholar, and in the same way. I have in my desk a raw-hide and a rattan, and they are slumbering lions. I have not touched them for a year, and I may not for a year to come, and I may the first of September. I make no promises or threats, but simply wish to have it known that I will use them if necessary.

I had a boy, who had been a very bad boy, and had been sent to the Reform School. I took the greatest pains to let him know that I would be just to him. I found, one day, that he had a quarrel with another boy. I had a regular trial, and I found that he was not to blame; and my decision of the case made him my friend for life. I found that his resistance was proper, because he was first attacked. I made a great deal of capital for the government of the school out of that circumstance.

*Dr. Miner.* I do not rise, fellow-teachers, to remark upon any thing that has been said here. But the attention which has been given to the subject of prizes has called to my mind what I wish some member of the Boston School-Board, or Mr. Philbrick, was here to state to you. It so well illustrates the general doctrine which has been called up, that I feel it would be profitable to present it to you.

A few years ago, I had the honor to be connected with the School-Board in Boston. For some time, there had been great stress laid upon the medals. I think gentlemen connected with the press of Boston will bear witness that there was thought to be nothing quite so creditable as to have borne a medal. There was no old official called away by the grim messenger, of whom it was not said that he had had



the high honor of receiving a medal in the Boston schools. But we found that, when only five or six in a school received them, there would be as many more so near it, and who had so confidently expected one, that they were unquestionably injured. And I see in the audience a gentleman who was a master of a girls' grammar school, who, I am sure, will bear witness that the high pressure brought to bear upon the more delicate females was most injurious to them, and, in fact, to wholesome, sound intellectual development.

Chancing to be on a sub-committee for drafting a report, a worthy clergyman, also on the committee, who wrote the report, eulogized the medal system. I immediately said, I did not wish to enter upon any war with the medal system of Boston, if the author of the report had been content to leave the matter alone; but, as he was pleased to eulogize it, I must give my dissent.

I believe the prizes, as then given, were injurious, and were made the occasion of great perversion of mind in those who expected to receive them. The consequence of the discussion upon that matter has been, that the system has been changed; and I think they have been banished from the Girls' High School.

*Mr. Brown*, of Boston, said they had been banished from the girls' schools, and next year were to be banished from the boys' schools.

*Dr. Miner*. As to the college of which I have the charge, I shall take the utmost care that the prizes given shall be for labor after it has been completely and fully accomplished, and that the system shall be one that shall not in any manner, by giving a prize to one, offer an obstacle to another.

The discussion was suspended here; and Mr. Stebbins, from the Committee on Nominations, reported a List of Officers. He stated that the evidences of skill and ability on the part of the present occupant of the chair, would have led the committee to report his name for re-election, had he not peremptorily declined. The same was true in regard to the Treasurer.

*Mr. Allen*, of Newton, presented the following resolution:—

*"Resolved*, That Article Second of the Constitution, referring to the terms of membership in the American Institute of Instruction, be amended by striking out the word "gentleman," in the first line and inserting the word "person;" and that after the word "his," in the fourth line, the words "or her," be added; and that the Constitution be so amended as to conform, in spirit, to the above amendments."

The resolution was laid over for action at the next annual meeting.

*Mr. B. F. Cruttenden*, occupied the remaining hour of the forenoon in a most admirable description of "*A Model School*."

#### AFTERNOON SESSION.

#### ELECTION OF OFFICERS.

The Institute proceeded at once, at the opening of the session for the afternoon, to the election of officers for the ensuing year; and the following were unanimously chosen:—

PRESIDENT.—John Kneeland, Roxbury, Mass.

VICE-PRESIDENTS.—William Russell, Lancaster, Mass.; Henry Barnard, Washington, D. C.; Samuel S. Greene, Providence, R. I.; Ariel Parish, New Haven, Conn.; George B. Emerson, Boston,

Mass.; Nathan Hedges, Newark, N. J.; Zalmon Richards, Washington, D. C.; John W. Bulkley, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Thomas Sherwin, Boston, Mass.; David N. Camp, New Britain, Conn.; John D. Philbrick, Boston, Mass.; Alpheus Crosby, Salem, Mass.; Ebenezer Hervey, New Bedford, Mass.; Henry E. Sawyer, Middletown, Conn.; Edward P. Weston, Farmington, Me.; Emory F. Strong, Bridgeport, Conn.; D. B. Hagar, Salem, Mass.; A. P. Stone, Portland, Me.; B. G. Northrop, New Haven, Conn.; T. W. Valentine, Brooklyn, N. Y.; J. E. Littlefield, Bangor, Me.; Joseph White, Williamstown, Mass.; Charles Hammond, Monson, Mass.; Abner J. Phipps, Medford, Mass.; John W. Dickinson, Westfield, Mass.; Merrick Lyon, Providence, R. I.; Elbridge Smith, Dorchester, Mass.; Samuel W. Mason, Boston, Mass.; A. A. Miner, Boston, Mass.; Albert Harkness, Providence, R. I.; M. H. Buckham, Burlington, Vt.; D. W. Stevens, Fall River, Mass.; David Crosby, Nashua, N. H.; Wm. P. Atkinson, Cambridge, Mass.; W. E. Sheldon, West Newton, Mass.; Homer B. Sprague, New Britain, Conn.; George M. Gage, Farmington, Me.

RECORDING SECRETARY.—George T. Littlefield, Somerville, Mass.

ASSISTANT RECORDING SECRETARY.—C. O. Thompson, Arlington, Mass.

CORRESPONDING SECRETARIES.—T. D. Adams, Newton, Mass.; J. J. Ladd, Providence, R. I.

TREASURER.—George A. Walton, Boston, Mass.

CURATORS.—J. E. Horr, Brookline, Mass.; Samuel Swan, Boston, Mass.; Henry C. Hardon, Boston, Mass.

CENSORS.—James A. Page, Boston, Mass.; C. Goodwin Clark, Boston, Mass.; Edward Stickney, Newton, Mass.

COUNSELLORS.—Charles Hutchins, Boston, Mass.; George N. Bigelow, Newburyport, Mass.; Wm. T. Adams, Boston, Mass.; A. G. Boyden, Bridgewater, Mass.; W. A. Mowry, Providence, R. I.; N. A. Calkins, N. Y. City; J. W. Webster, Boston, Mass.; D. W. Jones, Roxbury, Mass.; A. S. Higgins, Brooklyn, N. Y.; I. N. Camp, Burlington, Vt.; D. W. Hoyt, Providence, R. I.; E. A. Hubbard, Springfield, Mass.

## TRUANCY — THE EVIL AND REMEDY.

*Rev. B. G. Northrop* was introduced at this time, and read a valuable paper upon the subject of "*Truancy — the Evil and Remedy,*" which will be found in another part of the volume.

## DISCUSSION.

The next matter, coming up in its regular order, at three o'clock, was "*The proportion in which Knowledge and Discipline should be made the ends of Education.*"

*Thomas Hill, LL. D.*, President of Harvard University, read a brief and comprehensive paper, introducing the discussion of this subject. His remarks will be found in another part of the volume.

*Prof. Wm. P. Atkinson*, of Cambridge. I was very glad to listen to the paper just read by the President of Harvard College. Not long ago I read a statement by a teacher in Eton College, that any branch of knowledge, except languages of antiquity, was nothing more than an accumulation of utilitarian knowledge, as it was stigmatized; that there was needed a certain sharpening process, and that was to be obtained by studying, not the useful branches, and that it was a merit in the languages that they were not practically useful. That, as we know, is the extreme view of many of the advocates of the old curriculum of study. On the other hand, we have heard the question, "What is the use of knowing where Neptune is?" Suppose Neptune had taken it into her head to disappear, we might have said, "Go in peace, erring sister; we are none the worse for your departure." What is the use, for mental culture, of the Atlantic Cable?

It is nothing but a long string, across the ocean. That was the notion of one professor. That notion was built up on the theory that there is one sort of knowledge for the discipline of the mind, and another sort for use. In other words, that there should be one institution where the boys are to be sharpened, and another where they are to get their tools or learn how to use them. If there ever was a preposterous theory, this is one. What is meant by education, and what is meant by discipline? Is education one thing, and life another? Does education cease when the doors of the school-room close on the boy? On the other hand, it may be asked, what would be the use of this outward world, if it is only that we may plant and get food for the body, that God has spread out this universe, with its powers of interesting the mind? Must we go to words alone to get our education, and say that all this love has nothing to do with life? That is the logical conclusion of that extreme view.

And so, when a school of science is established, — a school which undertakes to prepare young men by a course of thorough scientific study for the labors of life, which require scientific knowledge, — we are stigmatized with the charge that it is utilitarian, that we can do nothing but give a boy the means of earning his bread. I undertake to say that a scientific school, established on that basis, is none at all; one that does not train and discipline the mind, is not fit even for the utilitarian purposes of life. It is an empirical school. On the other hand, that school which prepares the mind best for the highest purposes of life is the school which will give the young man the best mental discipline. Are we to place abstract studies on one side, and scientific and practical studies on the other? It does not seem so to me. The man who studies science, is studying language likewise. The student of science can no more dispense with a proper discipline in

linguistic studies than the student of language can dispense with scientific studies. The view of one side alone is futile. I am rejoiced, therefore, that the President of Harvard College has shown that these studies can be reconciled.

What is the consequence of barring out the other course? A retail merchant told me, "I have four graduates of college in my shop; and I would not give a boy, that I brought up to the business myself, for all of them." It don't follow that the graduates of college had got altogether a bad education, nor that the boy who had never been out of the store, had a good one. It would have been vastly better, if all had had an education which would have fitted them for their special places. Is it impossible to give an education which shall be not only disciplinary, but, in training the mind, fit young men for the best places for them? If we wish to bring up a boy as a blacksmith, shall we apprentice him to a confectioner? If abstract study was to be the labor of a man's life, he should be trained in those studies when young. Must the same course of study be pursued by a young man who is fitting for active life?

Again, has the Creator, in forming men, cast all minds in the same mould? Is the same course of study adapted to all classes, even as a disciplinary course? Is it not possible to conceive of the vast variety which goes to make up a universal education, so that it shall be represented by a certain number of factors, and not by one number; and that then the numbers may be changed, and by that very means suit better, and not worse, the different minds which the Creator has formed? It seems to me very evident; and that the dispute between the learned and utilitarian studies has no basis whatever, except in the minds of extremists on either hand.

Again: Can it be conceived that the universe has been



created as it has, and governed by those great laws which tax the highest intellect to comprehend them, and yet its study should not be meant as a discipline for the human mind? It seems an idea too preposterous to be entertained for a moment. I think these considerations are working in the public mind, and that the next step in the improvement of our education will be, to say that there is not one, but many educations; and we shall see that, as we have more railways running into the wilderness, the more cities and towns are built up, so the more varieties we have in education, the better off we all are. Neither school takes from the other. The young man can consult his talents, his tastes, and his future occupation in life. He can look upon life as it was meant to be, as a school from the beginning to the end. And he can lay his plans now with reference to all his future life, so that he shall not be left, at the end of his school life, utterly unprepared, and have to go through another and trying experience before he finds himself educated for life.

I think the next step is this; that these considerations are to be carried down into lower schools; that there we are to introduce the same variety which the young man can find when he has opened to him the doors of the university, the college, or the scientific school, and can select for himself. I think we can discover early the bent of children's minds; and that it is the great thing to be done now, to work out the true order of study, taking the minds of children as uniformly alike in the first place, and then, as they go on, let them take the departure to the right or left, as the talents of the child may demand. We must recognize all modern science; and not merely when the child has grown to be a young man, but in behalf of the children.

Therefore, the introduction of object studies and natural

history into the dry, dead, old curriculum, is a happy omen. I take it, the time will come when a young man will not be educated in language, so as to have enough for a college professor, and not know what makes water rise in a pump! What is wanted now is to put new life into your high schools. It is absurd to crowd young men with the dead languages, without giving any knowledge of the sciences. These studies should be introduced into the very primary schools. And this variety, and this recognition of the fact that all science, which is worthy the name, is disciplinary,—these are the ideas which are to revolutionize our education.

*Rev. Chas. Hammond*, of Monson. The views of the lecturer, Dr. Hill, seem to relate to a universal scheme of education, according to his idea of completeness. It may be well to speculate on ideal systems of educational development for the human mind, under the best possible circumstances, which time and opportunity can give; but, really, education, in all its modes and results, is a matter of degrees and limits. A boy or man cannot, in any seminary, do or know every thing useful to every body. Schools are rightly called *seminaries*, because, only the germs of knowledge and character are planted there. Colleges even, are only *institutions*, that is, places for *beginning*, not for *completing*, courses of study.

Hence, practically, that scheme of mental training for a pupil, is the best for him, which produces those results and tendencies, which have most to do with all his career as a man.

Some of the very best of these results, are ordinarily those which the pupil cannot very well appreciate, until he is no longer a pupil, and has become a man in thought as well as in action, having put away his "childish things" or notions about the utility of this or that study which he happened to

like or dislike when he was "a child," in that wisdom, which concerns the real use of studies.

Just now we hear the old *ad populum* outcry, against classic studies, on the ground that they are *dead languages*, because the people once using them as a vernacular, are no more. But the death of a people does not cause, of necessity, the *death* of their language or literature.

Really, the classic tongues are not dead, in *fact* or in *use*. The "roots" or "stems" of Latin and Greek constitute the basis of a large share of the words in all modern European languages. In these roots the very sense or soul of our modern words inheres. Old as Homer, they are the liveliest of things alive. Edward Everett, though counted as an old fogey, by these confident innovators, was right when, in his address, at the inauguration of the Washington University at St. Louis, he said of the classic languages that they may be called *dead*, by the figure *antiphrasis*, "because some of them have outlived ninety generations of our race, and will outlive as many more."

But admit they are dead or "*fossil*" languages, which they are not, still they would be not without their highest *educational* uses, on *that* account. Do the naturalists reject fossil remains as of no use in the sciences of zoölogy and botany, because they are *dead*?

A great deal is just now said against the ancient "college curriculum" by those who would reform Greek, if not Latin, out of Harvard and all other colleges, as a condition of graduation. These new dispensators of light and wisdom would try to make us believe that our American colleges have been blind imitators of English and European universities, especially in their adherence to the classics as the staple of college training, while the claims of science or naturalistic studies have been disregarded.

I deny the truth of these assumptions altogether. Those who make them are either dishonest or else they are ignorant of the history of either classical or scientific education in this country. Classical scholarship, in any true sense, is not an antiquity in any American college. Harvard has had the credit of taking the lead in the "humanity" studies; but devotion to them has not in our times been exclusive even there, nor do we believe it has been excessive. And how high, or rather how lamentably low, was the standard of classical attainments in Harvard at the beginning of the century, can be ascertained from the Memoirs of Dr. Channing, who, in his correspondence with Judge Story, tells us how much, or rather how little classical study was required when they were undergraduates.

Prior to the present century, the course of studies at Harvard and Yale was philosophical and theological rather than classical. The chief design of those institutions was to train Puritan ministers, and they were under the control of men who never had any great respect for English universities or European systems of education.

Never has there been any antagonism against scientific studies among the truly liberally educated men of this country. As soon as the modern natural sciences began to be, they were introduced into our college courses of instruction. Dr. Dwight, of Yale, hailed the dawn of the scientific era before it really began, and nominated Silliman as the professor of sciences, the first rudiments of which he learned subsequent to his appointment. Prof. Hitchcock, of Amherst College, began his illustrious career as a man of science, with the very beginning of that institution.

Three men at Yale College, forever to be identified with its fame, represented in its Faculty of Instruction, the three grand divisions in a general scheme of liberal culture. President Day was the teacher of pure mathematics; Pro-

fessor Silliman was the Nestor of American science; and Professor Kingsley, quiet, unostentatious, with a mind most acute and vigorous, and a taste which was the law of criticism, was a teacher of all good learning, ancient and modern.

Those three men were the richest endowment Yale College ever received; and they laid the foundations on which all her future teachers will build. They labored together in blending their formative influences on the minds and hearts of fifty successive classes of graduates. Their work was different, their harmony was perfect, their end the same,—the best good of their pupils. They were like some of the fixed stars, with a triplicate system having different colors, but shining forever as the rays of one star.

These three men were concerned, more than forty years ago, with this same question now claiming to be a new one, and attracting new attention in some quarters, relating to the comparative utility of classical and what are called practical studies, for a collegiate education. President Day and Professor Kingsley prepared a report on this subject, which Professor Silliman published in his *Journal of Science*; and thus that topic of debate was put to rest for one generation in that quarter.

It is indeed utterly vain to compare the relative value of things *essential* in a system to which they belong, be it education or anything else. By all means, let the Alumni of all our colleges graduate as Bachelors and Masters, not of one of the liberal arts, but of as many as possible. I say not that schools with partial or special courses are not useful or desirable. A one-handed man can be useful, and a child with four senses instead of five is worth educating. But schemes of study made for a proper University, should never be made to bend to the wishes of one-sided men.

Those who discard the classics, or science, or mathematics,

from systems of higher or middle education, are lacking in liberality. They need a judgment of greater comprehensiveness. They debate questions which admit no answers; such as, whether it is better for a tailor to make pants or coats; or, which of the two halves of a bean is most essential in the process of germination.

We have no fears that "the classics" will suffer in the issue of the recent strife about them. They will retain their proper place in all schools of liberal learning. They will be studied as essential helps to all the noble and useful sciences. They will be in "opposition" to none, except those "falsely so called."

#### CLOSING EXERCISES.

The Institute having previously voted to omit the usual evening session, on account of the severe storm prevailing, on motion of Mr. Tenney, of Newton, the topic under consideration was laid upon the table, and reports from the different States were called for.

*Col. Homer B. Sprague* responded for the State of Connecticut. He felt proud of that State, and referred to the labors of Dr. Barnard, and of Rev. Mr. Northrop, as having accomplished great and valuable results for the cause of general education there. The latter gentleman was at the present time awakening a new interest in the work. Among the things of which that State could boast was the fact that there was more land under cultivation in that State, in proportion to the population, than in any other in the Union;



and there is more wealth, in proportion to population there, than in any other State. There are some obstacles to the progress of education there, however. One very intelligent gentleman, and a leading man in the State, is doing all he can to break down the public schools. Less than half the children in the city of New Haven attend the public schools.

*Mr. J. B. Perry*, for Vermont, said it would be wrong not to say something in praise of the labors of the Secretary of the Board of Education in that State, Hon. J. S. Adams. He has been at the head of the educational forces of that State for about ten years. Everything was dead upon the subject when he commenced his labors; but he has worked indefatigably, by holding institutes, giving addresses, and awakening an interest which has caused Vermont to take a high rank in regard to education. The influence of the meeting of the Institute at Burlington, last year, was good, and led the people to strive for a more advanced position.

*J. W. Bulkley, Esq.*, spoke for New York. After a struggle for twenty years, the schools of New York are all free. Four new normal schools were incorporated by the last legislature. Teachers' institutes are held all over the State, and the wages of teachers go on while they attend. New York has made progress, and to-day is the proudest day she ever saw, in this matter. Most of the work there has been done by men and women from New England.

*Zalmon Richards, Esq.*, spoke for the District of Columbia. There are now eighty-four free white schools, and about sixty colored schools, in Washington; in Georgetown, about ten white, and fifteen colored schools. In the whole District, there are about two hundred public, and one hundred and

twenty private schools. Before another session of Congress closes, a good system of instruction is looked for. The teachers of the colored schools are from the North, and they are noble representatives of the teacher's profession. No greater success can be shown in the country than has attended the labors of the teachers in the colored schools. The vote of the colored population carried the day in June last, in the election of municipal officers, and the speaker had the honor of being one of the first municipal officers ever elected in Washington by colored votes.

*Mr. Hood*, of Minnesota, gave a glowing account of the progress and prospects of education in that State. *Hon. Mark Dunnell*, formerly Superintendent of Schools in Maine, had just been elected to and entered upon a similar position in Minnesota. The school-fund will soon be one of the largest in the Union, being nearly fifteen million dollars. Minnesota is the New-England of the West, in respect to education.

*Geo. M. Gage, Esq.*, Principal of the Normal School at Farmington, spoke for Maine. The Normal School of Maine began in 1864 with thirty-one pupils. During the last term there were one hundred and forty, and there were thirty-two graduated to go into the work of teaching. The foundations of a new normal school are laid; and there is a revival of interest in education throughout the State, and they were pressing forward for the front rank.

*Mr. Fletcher* gave a favorable account of schools and education in Illinois, particularly in the northern portion of the State. The teachers are many of them from New England. The salaries of teachers are higher there than in New Eng-

land. The normal school stands very high, and is sending teachers into all parts of the West.

*Mr. Mayhew* spoke for Michigan, and contrasted its present condition with what it was twenty-four years ago, when he went there. There was not then a voluntary teachers' association in the State, nor any educational society. Even in Detroit there was not a school-house worth five hundred dollars. He, as superintendent of schools, travelled five hundred miles in one trip on a French pony, to hold educational meetings; and the people would come from five to fifteen miles to attend the meetings. Now there are, probably, in Michigan, one hundred school-houses, worth \$50,000 each. Then the State University had not graduated a class. Now there are twelve hundred students. There is a very good normal school, with about two hundred students, and a system of county superintendents has been adopted recently.

*Mr. David Crosby* spoke for New Hampshire. Granite and men, articles much wanted in Boston and elsewhere, were among the products of that State. He thought the State stood well in regard to education. Graded schools are becoming more common, and there are other evidences of progress.

*Mr. Cowdrey*, of Sandusky, gave a good account for Ohio. They have a system of free public schools. They were largely indebted to New England and to this Institute for their present favorable condition. The doctrine that the property of all the people of the State should educate the children, was first taught in the East; but in Ohio they now stand as firmly on that principle as they do anywhere. The people are freely taxed to build commodious school-houses. He had come to the conclusion, from his observations, and from what

he had learned, since he came here, that Ohio was at least even with New England.

*D. B. Hagar, Esq.*, made a brief response for Massachusetts.

*Mr. Stebbins* presented the following resolutions, which were unanimously adopted:—

*“Resolved*, That, for favors received, contributing to the attendance, interest, and value of this meeting, we return our sincere thanks to the following corporations and gentlemen:—

“1. To the Officers of the several Railroads that have allowed to the members of the Institute a generous reduction of fare, viz.: Boston and Lowell; Connecticut River; Boston and Providence; Eastern; Boston and Maine; Boston, Hartford, and Erie; Western; Boston and Worcester; Fitchburg; and Old Colony and Newport.

“2. To the Proprietors of the Adams, Marlboro', Bromfield, Parks, and Winthrop Hotels, for the reduction of price so kindly made in our favor.

“3. To Dr. Lampson, of the School-Committee of Boston, for his felicitous and cordial address of welcome.

“4. To Hosea H. Lincoln, Esq., C. O. Thompson, Esq., Isaac F. Cady, Esq., Zalmon Richards, Esq., Elbridge Smith, Esq., Rev. A. A. Miner, D.D., Prof. D. H. Cruttenden, Thomas Hill, LL. D., and Rev. B. G. Northrop, for their able, just, pertinent, and instructive essays and addresses, copies of which are requested for publication.

“5. To William E. Sheldon, Esq., for the effort which he has successfully made to secure a full and impartial discussion of the important practical subjects that were placed upon the programme, and for the able, courteous, and efficient manner in which he has discharged the various duties of his office as President.

“6. To Granville B. Putnam, Esq., for the fidelity which has characterized the discharge of his duties as Treasurer.

"7. To Prof. W. P. Atkinson, for the cordial invitation extended to the members of this body, to visit the Institute of Technology.

"8. That the exceedingly pleasant and profitable exercises of this meeting ought to deepen our appreciation of the American Institute of Instruction, and to increase our willingness to labor to make it a still greater blessing and power to the cause of Education."

An invitation from Dr. Dio Lewis, to visit his school at Lexington to-morrow, was accepted by the Institute, with thanks.

On motion of Mr. Walton, the Directors were instructed to publish the essay of Mr. Lincoln immediately.

#### PRESIDENT KNEELAND'S ADDRESS.

The President elect, John Kneeland, Esq., was then conducted to the chair by Rev. Mr. Northrop, and accepted the position in the following address.

Gentlemen of the American Institute of Instruction,—I am not insensible of the honor you have conferred upon me.

I have too much veneration for this association, for the noble men who originated it, for the men who have presided over it, and the men who have worked in it and for it, not to feel—painfully feel—how unworthy I am to fill this position; still, I can but be grateful to you for this mark of your favor; and, believing I shall have your sympathy and hearty co-operation, I accept the office, and will try to discharge its duties to the best of my ability.

This meeting, now drawing to its close, has been one of unusual interest. Important questions have been considered, able papers read, and instructive lectures delivered. The

arrangements for the meeting, and the manner of conducting it, have testified to the ability and zeal of the retiring President, and I think that for him we need wish nothing more than that he may be as successful in his new undertakings as he has been in the educational field.

Gentlemen, the American Institute of Instruction is a progressive institution. It is conservative, in that it means to preserve all that is good; but it welcomes the freest discussion. It asks for new theories and new methods. I hope the venerable friends of the Institute will abide and work with us, still contributing their wealth of wisdom and experience. We want also the young men, who, in their freshness of life and noble enthusiasm, believe all things possible.

And, ladies, we have always invited you to come as visitors. The desire now is to admit you as members of the household. The proposition to strike out the word "male" from the Constitution, is to be acted upon at the next meeting, and it does not require a prophet's vision to enable one to predict the result. The doors of this association will be thrown open to you, and I know its members will welcome you with open arms and warm hearts. (Applause.)

My friends, I will not detain you longer. Allow me to say in parting, under these weeping skies, that I hope I shall have the pleasure of greeting all of you, and hosts of others, on some smiling morning, when the next summer comes round.

The customary Doxology was then sung as the closing exercise.



# LECTURE I.

---

## SCHOOL DISCIPLINE : ITS OBJECTS AND METHODS.

BY HOSEA H. LINCOLN.

MR. PRESIDENT, AND LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—

HAVING accepted an invitation from the Board of Directors of the American Institute to open the discussion of the theme, "School Discipline : its Objects and Methods," by a paper occupying only thirty minutes, I must be brief in the presentation of my ideas, passing rapidly over those points wherein all agree, in order to argue those features of the subject about which great diversity of opinion exists.

The object of school discipline is to train up children in the way in which they should go ; in other words, to make them good men and women ; to so train their minds, educate their hearts, and discipline all the faculties of their natures, that they will become, in after years, blessings to themselves and to society. The object of all teachers should be to educate the moral nature of their pupils, as well as to develop their intellectual powers ; and, in their

efforts to manufacture human character out of human nature, to imitate as far as possible the divine government.

The methods of school discipline are numberless. After a quarter of a century's experience upon different plans and methods, I feel myself a learner still. I am always adding to my magazine of expedients. A lifetime of study, observation, and experience cannot exhaust the possibilities of this subject. When we consider a single child, his hereditary nature, his home education, — received, it may be, under antagonistic parental influences, — his propensities, faculties, disposition, tastes, habits, will, his out-door surroundings; then multiply these by a hundred or a thousand, bring them together into a school; their wills begin to cross, their dispositions to clash, their propensities to project, — what complexity is here! Who can bring order out of this chaos? who can so mould and guide and govern and direct that these wills shall be rightly disciplined, these dispositions harmonized, and these propensities turned in the right direction? Where is the pilot that can steer his barque safely and surely through all these conflicting waves and cross seas, when he is liable at any moment to have a parental flaw strike him aback, or the popular breeze fail him in his hour of need? Under the most auspicious circumstances, is not the teacher's task a difficult one? What methods

shall he adopt to round off the projections and irregularities of his pupils' natures, and make all things move smoothly and harmoniously? His action upon them must be as constant, as gentle, as forcible, as unyielding, as the action of the water upon the rocks and pebbles of the sea-shore.

A teacher's character, his self-possession, watchfulness, general bearing, expression of the eye, tone of the voice, his sympathy, patience, cheerfulness, charity, are all effective instruments of discipline. He should be just; if possible, pre-eminently just; reasonable in all his requirements; never arbitrary, but always decided; gentle, but unyielding; firm but mild: in short the more of the Christian virtues he can embody, the better disciplinarian he becomes.

Love should be the main element in the discipline of every school. A teacher who cannot secure the affections of a very large majority of his pupils, is unworthy, in my estimation, of his position. There always will be some, however, in particular localities, who cannot in a limited time, under the adverse influences of the home and the street, be brought into subjection to the law of love. Many children in our midst are taught by their parents to smoke, chew, and drink; to lie, steal, swear, and bear false witness. An ancient philosopher, on being told that a notoriously bad individual had been speaking well of him, asked, "What *ill* have I done?" evidently con-

sidering praise from such a source censure, and censure praise. When you find the vicious and morally depraved, as a class, praising their teacher, be assured that he is neglecting his duty toward them. When rowdies love policemen, culprits prisons, secessionists unionists; when evil loves good, and Satan Christ,—then will the vicious, self-willed youth, love the restraints of the school-room. Yet I have known teachers blamed for not securing at once the affections of all of this class. They cannot do this without compromising the truth and their own consciences. How, then, are these malicious, self-willed children to be governed in a school? Must the divine law of love in their case be suspended? By no means. Let us rather imitate it, if we can, and not ignore the element of *force* inherent in it. If we make the way of transgressors easy, we are not co-workers with God. While I fully believe in the force of love, I do not believe in the love of force for its own sake. Government implies law; law implies penalty for its violation.

Witness the operation of the divine law, whose maker, God, is love. Every law that He has made,—physical, mental, moral or spiritual,—if violated, brings its appropriate penalty; until by repeated suffering, for continued violation, we are forced, or, if you please, forcibly drawn into obedience. Some appear not to recognize any element of coercion in

love; yet this principle in the divine economy is ever present, ever active. Our nation, in the recent war, understood this principle, when it coërced rebels into obedience. Love, rightly understood, is the only method requisite in the discipline of a school. All the inhabitants of the globe are at school; this earth is our school-house, and God our teacher. He disciplines us all in love. But what are its elements? — wisdom, justice, judgment, mercy, power, — all the attributes of the Deity are concentrated in his love. His affection for his offspring never degenerates into mere fondness. He always keeps in view the highest good of his children. He sees the future in the present; the end from the beginning. His love is always wise; his wisdom always loving. He is just, as well as merciful; even when he afflicts with trials, physical pain, and mental suffering, his love is ever active. “Whom the Lord loveth he correcteth, even as a father the son in whom he delighteth.” Physical pain brought back the prodigal to his father’s arms, and Christ himself was made “perfect through sufferings.”

Some, and they seem at this time to be many, do not appear to see any of the principle of love in the chastisement of refractory pupils.

As all parents and teachers agree that kindness, persuasion, and affection are the most effective elements in school discipline, but differ in regard to

compulsion, let me, in the time remaining, confine myself mainly to the discussion of the topic, — *The necessity of physical force as a method of discipline in our schools.*

The very life of our nation has been so recently saved by force, that all, it would seem, should recognize its importance in a government; if in the government of a *nation* or *state*, why not in a *school*? For are not all our schools miniature republics? Should not rebels in schools, if they cannot be otherwise subdued, be forced to obey? Would the community long permit wild impulses, untamed passions, and undisciplined wills, to be let out upon society, when, by the exercise of a little judicious force, these impulses could be tamed, these passions checked, and these wills guided?

Why is it that so many parents permit “the expedition of their violent love to outrun the pauser reason” upon this subject? Three causes might be mentioned: —

- 1st. An unwise fondness for their children.
- 2d. A lack of confidence in teachers.
- 3d. Ignorance of the trials and perplexities to which teachers are subjected.

I contend that none but teachers are competent to decide whether physical coercion can be wholly dispensed with in their schools. The power and right to use it should always be in their hands; having



this power and right, the necessity for its use is often prevented. Experience is a powerful educator. Let any one who believes in the omnipotent power of moral suasion in school government, be placed in some of the public schools of this city, and his principles would not long stand the test of experience.

Many years ago, Charles Sumner delivered the Fourth of July oration here in Boston. Though then quite a young man, I questioned his logic, though I listened with admiration to his eloquence. He was arguing against preparing for war in time of peace; against our heavy military and naval expenditures. One phrase he used, I have never forgotten. A ship of war was lying at that time in our harbor. He spoke of the heavy appropriation made for her construction and outfit, and argued in favor of diverting all such appropriations in future into other channels; he spoke of her as "swinging idly at her moorings." These were the opinions of Sumner, the scholar; of Sumner, the unfledged philanthropist. How was it, a few years after, with the assaulted Sumner, the battered patriot? Didn't a Southern bludgeon, in the senate-chamber, modify his ideas? Didn't he afterwards go for a vigorous prosecution of the war? Didn't the performance of the little Monitor with the Merrimac rejoice his heart? Did she "swing idly at her moorings" in New York harbor ere she started on her mission and executed it so grandly at

Hampton Roads? Didn't the guns of the Kearsarge, when she sunk the Alabama in European waters, delight his ears? Didn't they teach a forcible lesson to tyrants and despots, as well as to rebels? Ay! the principles of the young republic will yet follow the sound of those guns throughout despotic Europe. Yes! force has its mission in this world, — its God-ordained mission. Shortly after her victory, the Kearsarge visited Boston; would Sumner at that time have said the Kearsarge "swings idly at her moorings" in our harbor? No, thank Heaven! he is now the full-grown, symmetrically developed philanthropist and American statesman. Experience has made him so. Experience in some of our schools would make as great a change in the views of those who advocate the doctrine of no coercion of school-rebels.

All teachers, as far as I have heard, very much regretted to hear some high in our State councils recently say that, in their opinion, the time had come for the abolition of corporal punishment in our schools, and that its use was injurious to both teacher and pupil. This is "one of those seeming truths that the cunning times put on to entrap the wisest," born of the feelings rather than the judgment; of the wish, not the experience. Oh! if they could abolish the *necessity* for its use, they would have the heartfelt thanks of all the teachers of the country.

Could we kneel to any but the Almighty, we would thank them on our knees, with the profoundest gratitude, if they would abolish the necessity for its use ; but they cannot. To abolish punishment, however, while the necessity for it exists, would be like abolishing the fire department during an incipient conflagration.

Is its use injurious to the teacher ? If it be, then some of us who have taught so long, and been obliged occasionally to resort to it, must be by this time considerably demoralized. Hundreds of teachers, if they believed that punishment inflicted by them on rebellious pupils was demoralizing to their own natures, would immediately resign. It has always seemed to me that a disagreeable duty, conscientiously discharged, was elevating in its tendencies upon the moral nature. Teachers can never get riches or fame from their vocation ; but they can get wisdom, patience, self-denial, charity, and many of the Christian virtues, that no other profession will so largely give. Physical pain, inflicted by a kind-hearted teacher, is always a self-sacrificing act. Actions performed for the good of others are always ennobling in their tendencies. Experience and observation have also shown that punishment, administered wisely and in the right spirit, is not injurious, but, on the contrary, beneficial, in its effects upon the

character of children. Care must be taken not to confound the abuse of a thing with its proper use.

Our legislators, I apprehend, will not do so unwise an act as to abolish the use of force in our schools. Let them, if they can, institute the right kind of a home government in every family in the State, and the evil complained of will die a natural death.

Our representatives pass laws and appoint officers to force children to attend school. Will they pass a law that no force shall be used to retain them there? We take culprits to the lock-up, and criminals to the State Prison; if we pass laws that no force shall be used to retain them there, those that escape will soon be the only ones to applaud the wisdom of such legislation.

Can our legislators consistently abolish compulsory obedience in schools, sitting as they do under the very shadow of our State escutcheon, upon which is engraved the device of the raised arm and drawn sword, the scroll containing the inscription, "*Ense petit placidam sub libertate quietem*"? Ay! the enlightened State of Massachusetts seeks for quiet peace under liberty with the sword.

"The sword, extreme of dread!

Yet, when upon the freeman's thigh 'tis bound,  
While for his altar and his hearth,  
While for the land that gave him birth,  
The war drum rolls, the trumpets sound,  
How sacred is it then!"

Yes: the element of force in the government of nation, state, or school — if guided by a clear intellect and sound moral and religious principle — is always sacred.

Every State in the Union recognizes this axiom. So does the United States of America. The national gibbet in times of peace claims its victims, irrespective of sex. The gallows in our own State is yet a recognized power. Would it not be well for government officials to ask themselves this question, Should we advocate a stricter home and school discipline, might not these terrible extreme penalties be dispensed with in state and nation?

When we are asked by those high in authority to give up the use of physical force in the government of our schools, we feel like saying in reply, United States of America, disband your armies, demolish your forts, sink your monitors! State of Massachusetts, destroy your coat of arms, abolish your prisons and constabulary force! City of Boston, pull down your jails and dismiss your police; when you, Nation, State, and City, can govern full-grown, reasoning men, without force, then will we, school-teachers of America, promise to govern wayward, impulsive, unreasoning children, without force.

How sad should I feel to-day were this principle of force in government, a *false* principle; for in loyalty to it my own brother lies among the patriot dead

in the far-off South; and many a former pupil of mine, endeared to my heart, now lies mingling his ashes with Southern soil. Had we at the North been anti-coërcionists, a rebel flag to-day would have flaunted from Faneuil Hall and Bunker Hill; polluting the air, and disgracing the principles of New England. There are rebellious spirits at this hour among our youth who would, if they could, raise the flag of insubordination over many of our educational institutions, and flaunt it defiantly in our very faces.

It is difficult to enumerate all the methods by which a school should be disciplined. Methods must vary in different schools, and in different teachers. Ask a man how he would play a game of chess, or a general how he would fight a battle! No two battles are fought exactly alike; no two games of chess are identical. Your methods must vary with the varying elements, and the ever varying movements of your opponents. Discipline exists in the man. He must be equal to all emergencies. He must have brains to comprehend all issues, and energies to meet them. School discipline, as well as war, is a science. Civilians did not succeed upon the battle-field as generals, neither could many who criticize teachers so severely, succeed in the school-room.

A teacher can seize upon the most trivial incident to aid him in discipline. A ray of sunlight, darting across the room, can be directed by the skilful



teacher, so that it shall throw its cheering rays into the children's hearts. Teachers may refer to cloudy weather outside, to induce scholars to have pleasant weather within doors. Ever varying methods must be used to touch their hearts and stimulate their mental activities. Government must be fresh, spontaneous, out-gushing; always, however, under the control of a sound judgment: it must fit the man, the pupils, the hour, the occasion, all the existing circumstances. No rules or methods, studied and memorized, will ever make a good disciplinarian. Each teacher must study for himself the daily problems that arise. He will find—at least, in some schools—that the formula, Moral suasion equals success, will not solve all the disciplinary problems that arise. He will learn that he must have as many equations as there are unknown quantities.

While I believe in compulsory obedience, let me say, that we should never forget that physical chastisement is only a temporary expedient: it should never be regarded as an end. It is only a means to an end. The child is never really reformed by physical punishment, *per se*. It only puts him in such a condition that intellectual and moral forces can be made operative. This condition can never be secured in some natures, until they have been physically subdued. To subdue rebels, on the battlefield, is one thing; to reconstruct them, quite an-

other: but the one must precede the other. So with some rebellious spirits in the school-room,—they must be subdued by force, ere they can be reconstructed. Some pupils consider their teachers' forbearance towards them as an evidence of their timidity. They regard their instructors, just as the South regarded the North before the war. Hundreds of such children attend our schools to-day; and their number is rapidly increasing, under the stimulus of unwise parental influences and the seemingly growing distrust of the public in their teachers.

Why cannot parents and the community understand that, if they weaken the power of the teacher, and fill their children's minds with a disrespect for him and his authority, they thereby create the necessity for more punishment and severer discipline? If parents would save their children, they must sustain their teachers. When a great work is to be done, men must have power; they must be sustained by public sentiment. In the dark and trying hours of our revolution, Congress gave Washington almost unlimited power. Did he abuse it? In our recent terrible struggle, did not President Lincoln use wisely and well the mighty powers placed in his hands? To be sure, power intrusted to our Presidents can be, and has been, abused; but in the long run you gain far more than

you lose, by strengthening the hands and encouraging the hearts of those placed in offices of trust and responsibility. Teachers, to do their work effectively and well, must be trusted by parents, committees, and the community generally. All may not be worthy of trust, we know; let those that are not be at once removed, and competent ones put in their places. Personal vigilance by parents, as well as committees, over our schools, will do vastly more good than standing aloof and unjustly criticizing them from the basis of transient rumors or isolated facts. An ounce of knowledge will be found to be worth a pound of opinion.

Employment is one of the best methods of disciplining a school. That teacher who can keep the minds of children constantly employed, will succeed as a disciplinarian with but little physical coercion. There never was a truer maxim for the school-room than this, "An idle brain is the devil's workshop."

Let me urge upon teachers, if they would succeed as disciplinarians, a few ideas. No two schools can be governed in exactly the same manner; no two scholars exactly alike. To succeed, you must study the characteristics of the locality in which you labor; study the individual characters of your pupils, their home and out-door habits, their mental and moral peculiarities, — in short, their idiosyncrasies of every name and nature. Avoid fixed arbitrary rules.

Even at the risk of being unjustly called partial, you must not treat all pupils alike, even for the same offence. Some are not benefited by physical punishment; others are. Children should be governed according to their nature and temperament. Some can be subdued one way, some another. This matter of school discipline requires not only innate power and inborn adaptedness for the work, but patient and persevering study.

Time will not permit me to discuss the remedies for physical coercion. I will simply mention three of the most prominent.

1st. Judicious home government.

2d. Expulsion of refractory pupils.

3d. The establishment of Botany-Bay schools for the insubordinates.

Some year and a half ago, at the dedication of the Prescott School-house, a thought occurred to me, as the keys of that beautiful structure were presented to the master — a thought to which I will now, for the first time, give utterance. It will form, I think, a fitting close to the theme we have been considering. As I witnessed the ceremony of presentation, my mind ran forward to the time when thousands of youthful immortals would throng the spacious hall and commodious rooms of this magnificent edifice; and I said to myself, How little can city officials and school-committees really do! They present us

with splendid buildings, and keys to unlock the various apartments. But who will give us the keys to unlock the chambers of these youthful intellects, and furnish them with rich thoughts and noble aspirations? Who will give us entrance into the various apartments of these young hearts, and aid us in their right development? Who will give us the keys to unlock the beautiful temple of these children's souls, and make them fit for His indwelling? No city authorities can give us these. No committees or government officials can give us more than the outward. We must go to the great Teacher for these spiritual keys. We must sit humbly and reverently at the feet of Him who took little children in his arms and blessed them, if we would unlock the inner chambers of their being, and develop their natures through their affections. While believing, therefore, that compulsory obedience is far better than no obedience, let us — educators — ever remember that we have not *saved* our pupils until we have firmly established in them habits of obedience to principle; until we have taught them to love knowledge, truth, virtue, and goodness, for their own sakes; in fine, until we have so governed them that they shall have learned that best of all discipline — self-discipline.

We teachers, especially of Boston and vicinity, are living in trying times. In the present excited state of public sentiment upon the subject of school

discipline, we are frequently misunderstood and misrepresented; but let us do our duty fearlessly and conscientiously, feeling far more our accountability to God than to man, and remembering that but a few short years, at most, will pass away, ere we shall reach that better land where all unjust human judgments will be reversed, and righteous verdicts alone rendered.



## LECTURE II.

---

### HINTS TOWARDS A PROFESSION OF TEACHING.

BY C. O. THOMPSON.

WHEN a man has the privilege of discussing an educational topic, he must choose, with stern resolution, between the allurements of inclination and the dictates of duty. Circumstances, on this occasion, favor the syren. Colleges and schools have closed their doors, and the tired inmates—*vestigia nulla retrorsum*—hurry to their chosen scenes of relaxation. Teachers and pupils break the bonds of school-law, and enter, with exulting voices, that broader school, where nature teaches and blesses as well. We, who *teach*, anxiously help every effort of our struggling spirits to be free from the stifling embrace of routine and form, and to regain by a quick rebound the elasticity of thought and feeling which has slowly lost its force. The huge mill casts longer shadows. The great wheel has made its last heavy revolution. The gate is shut, and the glad water begins to fall

in a laughing cascade over the dam, and gushes through the seams in the heavy planks. The sound of the grinding is low. An evening coolness breathes a benediction over us. We bless Virgil and Theocritus for pastorals. We will almost embrace the blockhead and the rogue who have made our day so toilsome. We are children ourselves in the sudden rush of vacation joys,—

“We’re twenty, we’re twenty; who says we are more?  
He’s tipsy, young jackanapes; show him the door.”

This utter freedom peculiarly fits us for a social chat — *inter pocula* — if you please, about our work. The season is propitious. And now while all summer flowers are smiling at us, and all summer birds are singing to us, and the bright waters of all summer brooks are rejoicing with us, we meet to study the science of education.

Inclination calls us to leave the heated plain of dry discussion, and pasture our hungry scholarship in the green fields of æsthetic culture, where teachers seldom can go, save on holidays. But duty suggests that much useless labor has been during the past year; that some of our best endeavors have been fruitless; that unsymmetrical systems have rendered nugatory many of our best methods of instruction. A college professor says that one half of the senior class could not enter freshmen on examination.

Few graduates from college can read a page of prose Latin at sight, determine a geological epoch by examining its fossils, assign a Crucifer to its true genus, or decide whether or not there is lead in the water he is drinking.

When a faculty is needed for a technological institute, many are taken from the graduates of the *college*, to the theory and aims of which the plan of the *new* seminary is diametrically opposed. The college *classics*, mastered with surpassing skill, and giving in one mind the ripe fruitage of a persuasive style, are reflexively denounced in that very style.

"Who but must laugh if such a man there be, —  
Who, but must weep, if *Attacus* were he?"

The graduates of schools from which the classics have been carefully weeded succeed in special *lines* of effort, but so far fail in power of expression that we have few contributions from them to the literature of their own special branches of knowledge.

The demand of the times is for more natural science in the high-school course; but the demand of the *colleges* is for more Latin, Greek, and French.

Boys who graduate from the high school must be able to enter college: the door is narrow, and "*procul profani*" blazes over it. Again: Hundreds of boys are conditioned or rejected when they apply for admission to college, who have fitted in country

academies, who learn during their examination, for the first time, that it is a matter of consequence whether a boy says "*amābam*" or "*amābam*"; or whether he can determine the form of the quotient when  $a^n - b^n$  is divided by  $a - b$ . The boy is not always to be blamed. Who is in fault? These facts, noted by all careful observers, have led them to two widely diverse conclusions: one, that the study of the classics is undesirable, and the time now devoted to it disproportionate; the other, that the mode of *teaching* the classics is unscientific and bad; and that with better and more enthusiastic teaching, these studies would easily resume their legitimate place as the only reliable means of stimulating the imagination, educating the taste, strengthening the power of judgment, and developing skill in expression. The latter class grieve that through bad methods pupils must be largely excluded from the only literature which is untainted with sentimentalism. A thoughtful writer in the last North American Review says, "Sentimentalism was unknown before the time of Petrarch." Duty brings these anomalies to us in our hours of leisure and asks what shall be done. I must heed the admonition, and, without attempting to answer the question, will simply throw out some hints towards a profession of teaching; nor will I conceal a hope that in these hints there may lie the seeds of a system which when

fully developed may be at least a partial cure for some of the evils which at present beset our forms of public instruction.

This hope determines the line of thought to be followed.

I wish to make three points:—

1. There is no recognized profession of teaching.
2. There is a field to be occupied by a profession of teaching, determined by the organism of American society.
3. The times demand immediate action on the part of teachers, to secure the establishment of this profession.

First, then, there is no objective profession of teaching, recognized as such by the community.

Here the appeal must be to experience. Teaching lies in men's minds as a *business* rather than a profession, and one to be followed largely by those who cannot do anything else, or who resort to it as a temporary expedient. For instance, if an appeal is made to the manhood of the school-committee to raise the salaries of female teachers, the ready answer is, "Oh! supply and demand regulate this thing. We can get all the teachers we want at present prices." Indeed, the present phase of thought on this subject is not generally different from that revealed in Europe fifty years since, by Horace Mann's story of the helpless cripple who was put in charge

of a school because he couldn't move his limbs, and who had risen to that position from the more laborious business of tending hogs.

The same point is admirably put by Dickens, in the sketch of Mr. Wopsle's great aunt, "who kept an evening school in the village; that is to say, she was a ridiculous old woman of limited means and unlimited infirmity, who used to go to sleep from six to seven every evening in the society of youth who paid twopence per week each for the improving opportunity of seeing her do it." The New-England notion differs only in degree and in some modifications of detail.

The wise old uncle in Norwood, advising his nephew upon the choice of a profession, says: "Don't be a minister; you're not fit for it. Don't be a *teacher*; that's woman's business." This is a significant fact, considering the *source*! Let me mention one or two more drawn from a careful observation of the practical working of our school system, within *ten miles* of Boston—a portion of country, where, it is claimed, with much propriety, that the van of the educational host has encamped. Let it be premised that almost all school-committee men are men of honor and intelligence. Judging from personal experience, I should say they are the best men in their respective towns. But they are doomed to reflect, to a certain extent, the views and



feelings of the community, and cannot place their own standard very far in advance. Their hearts are generally right, but their heads often wrong. However monstrous some of the following incidents may seem, they are *representative facts*, and have counterparts in the experiences of many teachers. They illustrate, in a sufficiently graphic manner, the truth that teaching is regarded by men in general as a *business*; and that teachers' salaries are viewed in the same light as wages paid to operatives and mechanics.

In a town eight miles from the focus of intelligence, the female assistant in the high school receives for her services \$4.50 per week — just the sum she paid for her board while she was educating herself for the place, and less by one dollar than the wages paid the family cook by the chairman of the school-committee. The plea is, "She was educated at the expense of the town, and ought to repay in part." What delightful nonsense! By the same token, if no one stays in a town to "repay in part" the expense of his education, the town should be *indicted* for unwarrantable expenditure of public money. The truth is, that the town is under a sacred obligation to educate as well as possible every child in it. If it is fortunate enough to retain one of its children as a teacher, it ought to pay higher wages than if he were a citizen of another town.

In a village ten miles from Boston, the committee, for some reason, voted an extra holiday. All the teachers but one had drawn their pay in advance. When that one came to the treasury, he found his salary reduced by the amount due for one day. He declined to receive *anything* on such conditions, and appealed to the town. In open meeting, the town sustained the action of the committee. In this town, they estimate the amount of education acquired by the children, by the number of days spent in school, and keep their schools in session through the month of July. They should go one step farther, and admit scholars to the high school according to weight avoirdupois.

In another town, where cleanliness and godliness are unusually far apart, an esteemed and eminent teacher caught small-pox from one of his pupils, and was disabled for a month. At the end of that time, the committee suggested an addition of two weeks to his involuntary exile, as a precautionary measure, and then proposed, with singular magnanimity, to deduct from his salary the amount due for the time of his absence. They ought to reckon it a special favor of Providence, that he compelled them to pay the full amount by due process of law.

In a town seven miles from the capital of Massachusetts, a grammar master gave his pupils a picnic at his own expense. The half-day of school time

which he took for the sake of making his pupils happy, was deducted by the town-committee, in computing the time for which he was to be paid.

What parish would not hesitate to deal in this way with a successful minister? What successful lawyer or doctor would stay in such a town as any we have alluded to, unless to scourge the citizens with enormous bills? But I hesitate to touch the mass of accumulated incidents instructive on this point, drawn from the history of the *district system*. If there were no other objection against it, this would be fatal. The strange contagion of meanness is so deadly, that one *small* man as *prudential* committee, can belittle and ruin a whole school.

There is one topic in education that remains to be investigated; and that is, the natural history and effects of meanness, as developed under the district system. There we hear that mediæval talk about "cheap teachers." Under that system alone are developed men with the qualities of manhood in them; men, themselves the fathers of daughters; men who pray in meetings; men who would esteem it a deadly insult to be called unjust; men who read the ten commandments, at least every Sunday; men who cry out in horror at the very thought of negro slavery, proposing to pay negro cooks in their kitchens \$3.00 per week, and women in their schools \$2.50!

So long as the place of teacher is a matter of bargain; so long as it is solely an individual matter, determined by caprice or the state of the educational market; so long as there is no organized profession of teaching to resist organized tyranny, — such men, unwhipped of justice, will hold all fair in trade, and the teacher will be a football for everybody to kick. The fact is, it will not do to trust too much to unchecked human nature, even in the sacred responsibilities of the education of children.

“I’ll no say men are villains a’;  
The real hardened wicked,  
Who have nae check but human law,  
Are to a few restricked.  
But, och! mankind are unco weak,  
An’ little to be trusted;  
If self the wavering balance shake,  
It’s rarely right adjusted!”

But this view of the subject must be widened. It is a perplexing fact that most men of refined taste and scholarly culture are easily drawn away from lucrative positions in the general educational work, to professorships in colleges, which offer small salaries and narrow fields of labor. The opportunity for self-education and eminence in a single department is a strong inducement; but not, I think, the strongest. Many a great and good man leaves the mastership of an important school, where he is honored and beloved, by his pupils and the commit-

tee at least, to become professor in a college, not *always* his *alma mater*. He urges at the bar of his conscience many plausible reasons for his course. His friends do not blame, but rather encourage him. Yet that shrewd observer, Rev. George Putnam, said, at the dedication of the Everett School-house in Boston, in the presence of several presidents and ex-presidents of colleges: "A man here, in charge of a school of one thousand pupils, is equal to a college president, to all intents and purposes." Why this anomaly? The solution of the problem is found in the fact we are elucidating. Men find in the professorship and presidency, social preferment and dignity impossible in the school. *Professor* is a more potent word to charm with than *Master*.

Teachers are now placed under a kind of social ostracism for which they are not *wholly* to blame. It leads them to apologize for their occupation. A minister who succeeds in his profession becomes more completely a minister. Success stimulates him not to seek outside ends, but to press on in his calling. He labors to make all literary attainments, all intellectual vigor, all social and æsthetic culture, bear upon his pulpit efforts. This, all the more eagerly, because the reflex influence of his labor, in the quickened conscience and spiritual growth of his people, showing itself in words of encouragement and of judicious commendation, and in signs

more eloquent than words, gives him firm objective ground on which to build the structure of his life. The more he succeeds in the ministry, the better he loves the profession of preaching. So, too, the lawyer is fixed in the law by *success* in practice. The most successful lawyer is as far as possible from the gates of any other profession or business. Success in the profession of medicine makes it practically impossible for a physician to leave it. If he tries, his way is blocked by so great a multitude of impotent folk, all clamorous for help, that his heart condemns him, and he turns back to his work. There is a kind of fascination approaching superstition in the feeling of men towards a skilful physician.

But how is it in the profession of teaching? Here the law of success seems to be reversed. Success in teaching drives men who succeed out of it. In many instances men seem to regard success in teaching as proof of their *fitness* to succeed in some other calling. This cannot be explained by any suggestion of attractive positions or lucrative offices in other professions, for none is more destitute of these than the law and medicine, into which so many teachers flee for refuge. Nor can the desire for wealth be the motive power over those who enter other professions; for, in respect to wealth, over the door of every profession is written in clear letters, "Abandon hope all ye who enter here!" This stampede of teachers



can only be accounted for by their desire to gain a better social position. Good business ventures, and the allurements of insurance agencies, undoubtedly draw off some ; but it is mainly their own fault that the friends of public order and of public education are compelled to see the law, the ministry, medicine, and all sorts of business drawing the best men from the work of teaching. In how many biographies of eminent men occurs this paragraph : " In his early years, the subject of this memoir, being pinched by poverty, taught school to procure the means of completing his education " ! How many times have we heard fathers advise undergraduate sons to teach *one* year, because it's such valuable discipline ! How many times have we heard the undergraduate son announce his intention to teach a year or two, till he gets ready to study a profession. The number of men who have taught ten consecutive years in Massachusetts, where there are eight thousand teachers, is less than five hundred ; in Vermont less than one hundred ; in Connecticut the ratio is smaller still.

Let me enforce this point with one or two facts drawn from experiences far enough removed to render the allusion quite safe. In a certain town there was a dedication of a grammar school-house. The main hall was full of intelligent citizens. Following his inevitable destiny, the chairman of the school-committee, an eminent clergyman, called upon sev-

eral gentlemen to make speeches. After his list was nearly exhausted (without any allusion there, or at any time, to the master of the school whose building was dedicating), he proceeded to call up the master of the high school, in the following fashion: "It is very desirable on such occasions as this to have *all* classes of citizens represented. I therefore call upon Mr. —, the Master of the high school to *make a short speech.*"

Some people forget that the enthusiasm and learning of the teacher are the *germs* from which ideas grow. They forget that their children take their hue of character and thought from the teacher scarcely less than from the parent. They forget, in this constant effort to repress and belittle the teacher, Goëthe's pregnant aphorism, "Seed-corn should not be ground."

Note, in this connection, the ecstatic nonsense which deluges the local papers whenever a case of corporal punishment occurs in school, uttered by some men, otherwise sensible and good, who do not see that all the argument holds as firmly against *punishment* as against *corporal* punishment. It is *extremely* awkward to feel a policeman's hand laid upon one's shoulder. It is very humiliating to be compelled to board at the Commonwealth's expense. It is very galling to the spirit and delicacy of high-minded youth to be hanged for murder, even were

the murder done in the heat of drunken passion. It *is, perhaps*, very degrading to the judge to pronounce the sentence of the law, and to the criminal to hear it. But if judge and jury are essential elements in society, they must appear, in germ at least, in that microcosm called a school. And if the *man* were to avoid judge, jury, and executioner, he must be taught obedience to law when a boy. Outraged justice must in mercy, and with discretion, visit the young offender with punishment, lest her heavy hand fall upon the maturer criminal and beat him to powder.

This hue and cry about corporal punishment would not be worthy of more than a cursory glance, in discussing this subject, were it not true that the plausible arguments of fanatics are misleading many excellent people. The great heart of the people is right, and beats true to truth and justice. And tardy justice is done in many cases where the facts are clearly stated. This unusual and sudden sensitiveness is a subtle evidence that there is a deep conviction in the public mind, that the absolute despotism of the public over schools is decaying, and will soon be supplanted by a representative government according to the American idea.

Let me not be reckoned a cynic. It is not that men do not enough for schools, generally, but that they do not acknowledge their indebtedness to teach-

ers as to other professional men. It is scarcely two years since education was recognized as functional by the United-States government.

When a minister is worn out with labor, he is sometimes enabled by the generosity of his people to travel and regain his energy. How many *teachers* receive similar tokens of regard?

Orators and poets, the mirrors of popular sentiment, are almost all silent on the subject of education. Horace Mann devotes one lecture to the Dignity and Degradation of Education, and with great beauty says, "The Muse of Education is yet to be born." The best ideal schoolmasters, so far, are Dominie Sampson and Ichabod Crane.

Cuvier, when he visited the schools of Holland, noticed with great satisfaction the attention paid to the comfort of the schoolmaster. Cousin enlarges on the same point in his memorable Report on the School-system of Prussia.

The inference is irresistible, that the idea has not yet taken full possession of the public mind, that a man should be a teacher and nothing else; as a man should be a doctor and nothing else, or a minister and nothing else, or a lawyer and nothing else. It is not confessed, as sometime it must be, that, without such teachers, Dr. Wayland's noble conception of education can never be realized. "The object of the Science of Education is," he says, "to ren-

der mind the fittest possible instrument for discovering, applying, or obeying, the laws under which God has placed the universe."

Plato said, "Man cannot propose a holier object of study than education, and all that appertains to education."

The present age is as far behind Plato in *this*, as in other things, that it does not yet recognize the profession that underlies, enfolds, and permeates all other professions and callings.

The greatest men have acknowledged their obligation to the school. The men who sway the sceptre of almost universal power, at the Court of St. James, learned how to use it at *Eton* and *Rugby*. I do not envy a man who can read without emotion that passage in "Tom Brown at Oxford," where he comes back from the high activity of the university to shed a strong man's tears at the grave of Arnold of Rugby.

Daniel Webster laid on his *alma mater's* brow the laurels that admiring senates laid on his own. He was great in his peroration against Hayne; skilful in his conduct of the prosecution of the murderers of White; but never so fully sublime as when, in the Dartmouth College case, raising his hand in the Supreme Court, in a voice tremulous with emotion, he exclaimed: "Sir, there are those who love her!"

Considering, then, that there is no profession of teaching recognized by the community, it is necessary to define terms and to find the boundaries of the field to be occupied by it. A very careful writer, the Rev. Hugh Stowel Brown, in urging the need of more thoughtful living, says: "The present has its achievements. It has the printing-press, and railroads, and extensive manufactories. But its superiority consists more in a greater power of production and in the wider diffusion of wealth and knowledge than was possible in the past, rather than in the intrinsic excellence or beauty or brilliancy of what it *does* or *achieves*." If this conclusion is reached through careful study of the forms of *English* society, how much more might be said of the American! The all-powerful deity which we worship is utility. Every year adds some hundreds to the inventions at the Patent Office; but we do not build any nobler buildings or safer railroads. We fail to keep the wolf from the door of our ministers and teachers, while the merchant and manufacturer grow opulent through the gratification of our tastes and caprices. At best, the telegraph, steam-engine, are material, and concern man's lowest needs. Prof. Peabody says: "These triumphs of Art are simply Titanic—the development of earth-forces; and they make no approach toward the solution of spiritual problems." We have a church,



a Sunday-school, in every village of the North at least, but no better men than years ago. The country is deluged with books and papers. Benevolent societies multiply to meet every conceivable need; but they are mainly a delta of mouths for the same stream. The few who love study and reflection, growing less each year, mourn apart. The age cries out for better culture. Known appliances fail to reach known evils. Will attention to moral duties once a week be sufficient to keep even children under a strong impulse toward good? Will the labors of mothers and fathers in families save boys and girls from foolish thinking at that critical age when the new strength of young manhood seeks help and guidance outside the narrow bound of the family? It is admitted that the school is one of the four organic forces that shape and regulate society. These are, the family, the school, the church, and the state. But is equal importance given them in the practical application of this theory? Is it not true that men in general practically assign to the school the lowest place? Not just in this town or neighborhood, perhaps, for a very good reason. But this Institute ever would fail to draw an audience in almost any other town or city in America, with a half-dozen exceptions. Still, figures show great progress. There is a general overhauling of all our systems of philanthropic, benevolent, and religious

effort; a kind of *renaissance* in the department of social reform. Men who sneered at social-science meetings, when such things were first proposed, now attend them, and listen to the proceedings with profound interest. The best men in the country discuss educational topics. Better instruction is demanded in public schools. There is a well-marked tendency to unification and concentration in benevolent societies—an unmistakable symptom of vigor. There is a strong conviction, springing from intuitive knowledge, that something is wrong in our whole system. There is a need that must be supplied. I shall be so bold as to assume that the school, as an organic force, must be elevated and unfettered, and that this can only be done through a recognized profession of teaching. The need of some established centres of influence, some focal points of information, some crystallizing force in education, is seen in the feverish eagerness of intelligent citizens to adopt, at once, new systems of instruction. Because one woman, with heroic self-sacrifice and almost sublime patience, has succeeded in teaching a *few* deaf mutes to articulate, straightway there is an outcry against the sign-method as barbarous and clumsy; though more quiet people who have studied the subject in Germany and France, as well as in America, tell us that all experience shows that only a small part of this unfortunate class can receive any help from this

new method. Another sign of the times points to the same need—the general unfitness of teachers for the higher positions in their own professions. If a man is sought for a college president, he is taken from the pulpit. If a town superintendent is needed, he comes from the ministry oftener than from any other profession.

What, in the proper work of the ministry, qualifies a man for the direction of the affairs of a college or a system of town schools? Unless I mistake greatly, those eminent men who have managed our New-England colleges have gained the practical wisdom and administrative power which made them illustrious outside their regular routine.

The profession of teaching must furnish men for the work of instruction. It must also be one of the agencies, if not the most potent one, in evoking the art instinct in the American people, so that the unclothed forms of *American* production, grand as they are, shall be robed with grace and beauty. There is no special agency now at work to achieve this result. Though many altars burn to Apollo and the Muses in humble temples, in our Athens there is no Parthenon.

The *art* of teaching is complementary to the *science* of education. It is not a science. In this most sound thinkers agree. Dr. Wayland first announced it in this country. Cousin and Cuvier held the same

view (Herbert Spencer holds it in the main, and so does Matthew Arnold), though some of these writers occasionally use teaching and education as interchangeable terms. The science of education is the systematic arrangement of the ultimate principles, and the facts as explained by those principles, which regulate and determine the development of the mind. Like every other true science, it does not concern itself at all with the application of these principles. In this science, as Karslake says, "*scimus ut sciamus.*" It is the condition precedent to all effective action of the intellectual powers. It is the science which underlies all other sciences — the one without which there could be no other. The more men study it, and the more complete their comprehension of it, the nearer they come to God. The other sciences have kept even pace with it in its progress. When it is fully understood in its bearings upon the mental and moral nature of man, the problems of social relations will be solved, and all men will be happy.

In the *art* of teaching, in the felicitous phrase of the author just quoted, "*scimus ut producamus.*" It is the art of *applying* the principles of the science of education, — an art more difficult in detail, more exhausting to the artist, demanding more delicate manipulation than any other art to which men have ever given attention. For its materials are the emotions, passions, instincts, consciences, and active

powers of human beings. Its work, good or bad, is indestructible. Like Zeuxis, the teacher paints for the future. Like Michael Angelo, he could see, were his eyes not holden, legions of angels watching and aiding him in his work. Unlike any other artistic product, bad work in teaching can never be undone. If a painter finds a faulty tint or untrue perspective, a dash of his brush blots it out forever. A sculptor can change his lines again and again till the instinct of proportion is satisfied. But the teacher has no such liberty. Every act of instruction or of discipline, every subtle impulse of the magnetism which flows from teacher to pupil, when sympathy is perfect, goes to shape an enduring monument to his glory or to his shame.

Will common sense permit us to take a lower view of teaching than this? What, then, says common sense of those who rush untutored into this work? What does common sense say of those who deny that there is a field for a profession of teaching? There is knowledge enough on this subject, but it is not accumulated. The spirit of organic union must move on these scattered elements. The facts and principles of the science of education must be conserved and be in the control of an organized profession in order to the greatest efficiency.

A *profession* implies innate aptness for special labor, earnestness, enthusiasm, and, above all, accumu-

lated knowledge at ready command. Hence no man can be a successful professional teacher in the broadest sense who is not apt to teach, who lacks singleness of purpose and purity of heart and life, and who has not some acquaintance with the *literature* of the science of education. It implies, if any profession implies, special professional training and special rewards for professional success. Yet it is true that our countrymen tolerate, in the most important of professions, a course of conduct which in the less important we stigmatize with opprobrious epithets.

In their views of the qualification of teachers, they are much like that New-York church that advertised in the Tribune for a "minister with genteel ideas about sin."

The work of American teachers is to fit boys and girls for noble living, and to prepare men and women to enter upon special forms of labor. Ministers, physicians, lawyers, and teachers, engineers, chemists, geologists, botanists, must be taught the principles of their chosen occupations. All enlightened nations believe that thorough public instruction, good enough for the best and not too good for the poorest child in the country, is essential to the safety of civil institutions, and especially is indispensable to the maintenance of civil liberty. It is impossible to overestimate the importance of thorough intellectual and moral training in public schools, when their



connection with the State is considered. The intelligence of a community generally determines its prosperity. The late admirable Superintendent of the Ohio Schools, Mr. White, states, in his last report, the actual increase of crime in one county of the State precisely gauged by the increase of tardiness in the public schools as shown by the Registers.

It is not sufficient that the public school makes children wiser—it must also make them better. Otherwise public instruction will inevitably become a tremendous engine of mischief. Horace Mann, in his first report, says, “It has been ascertained by a late writer on the present condition of France, after a minute examination, that most crimes are perpetrated in those provinces where most of the inhabitants can read and write. The ratio has been preserved with mathematical exactness. The cultivated *intellect* presents to the *uncultivated* feelings, not only a larger circle of temptations, but better instruments for their gratification.” Both these facts are representative, and are verified in the experience of every educator. In truth, people in this country are as free from restraint in wrong as in well-doing, as far as external and coercive agencies are concerned. In France, a policeman follows a suspected man like his shadow. The suspicion confirmed, all hope flees. The galley and the prison shut out the criminal from all good. It is not much better in

England. But in this country the passions of men are little restrained by sights of the dreary sweeps of convicts' oars, or the hideous uplift of the guillotine. Our belief in the sanative power of our institutions is so great that we cheerfully turn over the most outrageous traitors to be whipped of their own consciences, and to be punished by seeing, so long as God lets them live, the bony fingers of their murdered fellow-citizens pointing at them from thousands of graves. Hence we must rely mainly for the perpetuity of the results of our institutions, upon *public instruction*, in furnishing internal springs of happiness to every man; in rendering every man the best possible companion for himself; in quickening every man's conscience; in elevating and ennobling the whole people, so that they not only know their duty, but their rights; "and knowing, dare maintain."

This department of the field assumes immeasurable importance, when the relations of the educator to the future of the country are considered. Reconstruction must be largely in his hands. How to make citizens of rebels, is his problem. There must be a normal school at every State capital, in charge of the best men to be found in the country, where teachers can be trained to help in the solution. What an exalted, patriotic, blessed work! The wonder is not that some have undertaken it at much

self-sacrifice, but that thousands more have not. Through the rifts, in the black clouds of war, breaks from the serene sky, upon the much-troubled land, the light of knowledge and of peace.

The individual is the fundamental idea in American politics. Complete, self-reliant individuals, must be the aim of public instruction. To this end the graded system is admirably adapted. It often fails on account of deficient administration; not, as Mr. Frazer thought, on account of any organic defect. When thoroughly carried out, and informed with the manly enthusiasm of an energetic head-master, it will be found nearer the true idea of an American school than any other can be.

Again, it is of the utmost importance to have well-trained men in the professions, and hence arise the strictly professional schools.

The field to be occupied by a profession of teaching, then, is the work of public instruction, with its subtle and vital relations to the growth, improvement, and permanence of the American Republic.

We are next to consider what must be done to establish this profession. First, the district system must be abolished throughout the country. It is strange that, when the new towns of Illinois find a graded system better, even in their infancy, the older towns of the New-England States should cling with so much pertinacity to a system that has

so little to be commended and so much to be condemned. This reform can be accomplished by inducing towns to adopt a simple plan of concentration, by which all their school-buildings can be utilized, and, in many cases, no new ones need be built.

A field must be made large enough for a strong mind to work in it. Till that is done, schools will be furnished either with inexperienced or with weak teachers. Men must be satisfied that their positions are equal to their capacities, in order to work efficiently and easily. Graded schools can be improved by giving the grammar-masters some control over the lower schools. If pupils are grounded in the elements of knowledge when they reach his department, he can combine those elements in higher forms ; if not, his time must be largely spent in the dismal work of undoing what has been badly done. But let all the grades feel his influence, and all the teachers\* work with him in cheerful co-operation, and the happiest results must follow.

But what shall be done in towns where the district system obtains? First, abolish the system, then reconstruct the schools on some simple plan like this : —

Let the town place in the most central and accessible position, a handsome, commodious school-house, surrounded by ample play-grounds, and furnished

with all needful apparatus. Let this be for a grammar-school, in charge of a competent master, with a salary of \$600 per annum. Let him, with his assistants, instruct all the scholars in town of the age requisite to enter the grammar and sub-grammar grades. This obviates the difficulty, so often suggested, that little children cannot walk far to school. Let all the other schools in town be taught by women, and be composed of primary and intermediate pupils. Let these be kept for as many months as the town can afford; and in the old houses till the town can afford to build new ones. The expense of this arrangement will not be much greater than that of the old one, and the children will enjoy all the essential advantages of a graded system. In such towns the young professors of teaching could start under auspices as fair, at least, as those of ministers and lawyers. Their income would increase as their services became more and more valuable, till the limits of proper expenditure were reached in any given town. Then would come the inevitable call to "go up higher," and the inevitable result.

I believe that the loose and unmanageable methods of the district system have a close and inevitable connection with the thousands of loose, aimless, and useless lives which appal every student of social science. As far as I have had opportunity

to study this subject, and to collect statistics, I am convinced that, of those boys and girls who end their lives prematurely through vicious indulgence, or prolong them in the miseries of judicial punishment, a much larger proportion come from the country than from the city or its vicinity. The standard, shrewd, old merchant, who takes the charming, simple boy "straight from the country," has seen some reasons for changing his views; and that traditional boy must have gone back to the country, for he has vanished from the city. It is true that *some* facts, at least, corroborate the theory, that the steady formative influence of skilful men and women, in a graded system, who give their lives to the work, must produce a generation to their praise.

Again, we need more Superintendents of Schools.

We need them as in Illinois, Ohio, and California. These States are far in advance of us in regard to efficient supervision of schools. They think money expended in education should be looked after with as rigid scrutiny as money invested in stocks. These superintendents should be in every county. Nothing struck M. Victor Cousin so forcibly, when he examined the school system of Prussia, as its effective supervision. If any thing goes wrong in gymnasium or university, it is reported to the proper officer, who dispatches a person to adjust matters at once. *These* places need not be filled with professional teachers



entirely, but would attract, as in France and Prussia, other men of large means and education, who would be valuable auxiliaries in carrying forward every educational enterprise. Thirteen county superintendents in this State alone, with salaries proportioned to the dignity and responsibility of the office, would act as a powerful stimulant on all professional teachers; for only such teachers should be appointed to such offices. These could aspire through all the years of hard labor to the simple business of supervision, with its correlative advantages of varied work and social preferment.

An organized profession is needed to harmonize and unify existing educational agencies. The expert in medicine meets his brethren at conventions, and gives them the benefit of his high attainments. Learned divines, whether pastors or professors in theological seminaries, meet the younger brethren in associations in free discussion. In any profession it is desirable that its members of every grade should act and re-act upon each other, so that there shall be community of interest, unity of aims, and cordial sympathy in achieving the work assigned to that profession. But when do college professors meet school teachers? Are not the different classes of educators almost hopelessly segregated? Do not ministers' meetings draw together a larger number of men from college faculties than any meeting for

educational purposes. Who can estimate the benefits that would flow from a living contact between departmental instructors and school teachers, in giving the former the facile skill and practical knowledge of human nature which characterize the latter, and the latter the grace and culture of the former.

But another point where reform is imperatively demanded, is the mode of examining teachers. In many parts of the country, men of every conceivable vocation claim to know more about teaching than teachers themselves. Farmers, shoemakers, blacksmiths, joiners; the man who married a fortune; the man who never had but three months' schooling; the fearful man, who has kept school himself,—sit in judgment on the candidates for the post of teacher in their public schools. But the objector says, Ministers are examined. So they are; but they are examined by their peers. Only teachers should examine teachers. The matter of settling a pastor is really determined by his appearance in the pulpit. Let a teacher be judged mainly by his teaching. It is impossible to see what can be ascertained about a teacher by the current system of examinations. Certainly not his fitness or unfitness to teach; for many who pass a shocking examination turn out admirable teachers. The converse is also true. They undoubtedly do furnish a fine opportunity for men who ride hobbies to exhibit

them to the best advantage. The candidate may or may not choose to ride them all ; if not, he is in too many cases reckoned unfit to teach.

Even graduates from the normal schools are not exempted from this wretched annoyance.

California has the honor of perfecting and applying a simple and natural method. In that State, the Board of Education issue certificates to those whom they have examined, who are not normal-school graduates ; and to all who are graduates. These certificates entitle the holders to teach in any school in the State, under suitable limitations. Other States have adopted the same plan. What is needed in Massachusetts is an act of the Legislature, authorizing the Board of Education to issue State certificates, after a written examination, and making these legal passports into any school in the Commonwealth. The same force should be given to normal-school diplomas. Then, preference should be given in respect of salary to those who hold these professional papers. The board would, of course, *require* in all candidates a certain amount of information on the general science of education, and the theory and practice of teaching. This point is important, because here the reform we are urging must begin. The very next Legislature might be memorialized on the subject, and might pass the necessary act. Otherwise, our sister States will continue to surpass us in

the simplicity and effectiveness of their school systems. On the other hand, no State can exert so great an influence over others in any educational matter as this. A plain corollary from this argument is, that the number of students in our normal schools ought to be largely increased. It is probable that these will ultimately become training schools for women, where they can receive an education measurably equivalent to the college course for men, and that we shall have a department of instruction in the art of teaching in the university course for men.

This subject has a most important bearing, at this point, upon the much-vexed question, "What shall women do?" We have not yet practically admitted that women can do some things better than men, and that they should be paid according to the value of their labor. It is because the elements of the profession of teaching are chaotic, and its field undetermined, that so many competent, high-minded, enthusiastic women, are out of employment. This may help us to understand the paradox we have all wondered at, when a woman has followed a man in the same school, and received half as much pay for doing the work twice as well. That is, a first-rate woman is worth to a Christian community, in the middle of the nineteenth century, just half as much as a second-rate man. The first thing is to give woman

her place. Woman is God's appointed educator for all the children of the human race. It is on account of ignoring this principle that we are compelled to confess that the art of elementary teaching has made very little progress during the last twenty-five years. The education of children, up to their teens, must be intrusted to women — exclusively, if you please. When they enter the grammar school, they should feel the power of the masculine will. Men should do the teaching in this period. But when boys and girls enter the high school, or the stage corresponding to the high school, they need the combined influence of the best men and the best women. A refined, enthusiastic, well-qualified woman is as useful to girls and boys in a high school as she can be in a primary. Upon the perplexing question whether the sexes should be educated separately, beyond the high-school epoch, I will not enter. But one thing is sure, so long as we give girls and boys an equal chance up to that point, and then rudely shut out one sex from the larger culture we bestow so liberally on the other, let us not say much about woman's incapacity. Woman's weakness, in that case at least, is a euphemism for man's injustice. Woman cannot be educated too well. She cannot know too much. It is probably true that there are certain intellectual achievements to which she is inadequate. It is true that invention, government,

and leadership, must be in the hands of men. But, so long as women are the mothers of boys, so long it will remain true that the more the mother knows, the better men the boys will become. Women ought to crowd our normal schools for thorough professional training.

A girl must feel a stronger mind. It is possible for some rare woman to exert this power; but, it must be confessed, in many cases, they gain it at the expense of their own gentler womanhood. It is according to experience that nature is sometimes capricious in the application of every general principle. There are men who ought to have been women, and there are women who might have been men. But, granting that schools exclusively for girls may prosper under the sole management of women for a while, I must claim that men must be the mainspring of the profession of teaching. I cannot comprehend the philosophy of those who would have women do all the teaching. If all run to shout *Io triumphe!* in Apollo's train, who shall tend the fires in the temple of the Graces?

A profession of teaching demands accumulated learning on the subject of education, and a collection of books. It requires concentration of effort and attention for a lifetime. It must be the paramount aim of life. But what woman, except, perhaps, Mrs. Willard, ever collected a library of educational



works? How many in this audience have read Horace Mann's Lectures and Reports? What woman really intends to devote herself to the cause of education with such complete self-sacrifice that she would reject what seemed to her a good offer of marriage, for the sake of her profession?

If any woman would do that, she certainly isn't fit for a teacher. Marriage ends teaching for a woman, but urges man to higher and intenser efforts. Horace Mann says: "The intellect of woman, like that of man, has the sharpness and penetrancy of iron and of steel; it must also be as cold and as hard. To be the former of wise and great minds, is as much more noble than to be wise and great, as the creative is higher than the created. The instincts of the true woman point to the *home* as her true sphere. There she sits a queen, and from her throne of beauty rules the world. But man, the pillar on which her throne rests, looks at life as a whole, and home as a refuge from its tempests. *His* aim is success in his life-work. No instinct in him but urges him to attain it. If he marries, he has only a new and stronger inducement to persevere. Hence, there seems to be a law of nature, that teaching must be made men's work before it can rise to a profession." "But," says Madam, "what shall those thousands of women do who cannot marry? Shall they while away their lives with

folded hands?" By no means. They must teach; they must have better pay; more places must be opened to them, in a way to be explained presently. They must have sole charge of the lowest, and joint charge of the highest, grades of schools.

If, then, men must lead in organizing a profession of teaching, we want the best men. Unfortunately, it must be admitted that it must be made desirable in a pecuniary point of view to enter and remain in the profession. Enthusiasm and earnestness *will* grow faint under the pinching of poverty.

It is clearly shown by the investigations of Mr. Chadwick in England, Horace Mann and Mr. Barnard in this country, Baron Cuvier and Victor Cousin in France, the Netherlands, and Germany, that *ten years* is the average length of service of teachers. Teaching is found to be the most exhausting and destructive business in which educated men engage. The tendency to immediate dissolution discovered by many men is one of the considerations that drives them out of the profession. No man can afford to live for the day alone. No man can do anything else productive of income, to any purpose while he is teaching. Hence the teacher must therefore look to teaching to supply not only his more pressing and immediate wants, but also to give him the coveted, glorious privilege of being independent when his strength faileth. When that remorseless suppression

of ambition and of hopes and wishes is laid upon him ; when that inevitable time comes that comes to the teacher sooner and with more appalling foreboding than to most other men, that marks the point beyond which he sees that he cannot dwell longer with youth. I do not stop now to note the many noble exceptions, the present concerns itself with general truths. A successful physician may by strict business economy save himself from penury. His experience makes him valuable in consultations and as an expert, and he is seldom reduced to great straits. The successful minister is sheltered against want by the kindness of those to whom he has ministered in spiritual things and for whom he has cheerfully sacrificed all hopes of earthly competence for the Master's sake. A successful lawyer is to blame if he does not provide against a time of need. His experience also is valued. That lawyers should grow rich, is to be expected in the present condition of American society. But who wants an old teacher? What parish cares for him who sacrifices more than any other man for his fellows, because he cuts himself off from means of culture and improvement. What court or council respects and values his experience? Who knows it when he dies, or who visits his grave? But he has a monument, though not of bronze: temples, not made with hands, rise in his honor. His is the hidden but sublime work of burying the foundation

on which others build. Men see only the fair proportions of the finished building, but only the thoughtful consider the hidden work on which it all rests. But God sees it, and shall one day declare it; and the teacher will then receive the due reward of his labors. This prophecy he holds fast, and, calm in the assurance of the grandeur of his work, he toils on to finish it. But all this does not supply his needs. People say, supply and demand is the law of business, and must rule here. That is the last subterfuge of meanness, when dragged to light by the hand of conscience. It is not just. The average pay of teachers is higher than of any other profession; but not the salaries of *successful* teachers. The unfairness of drawing any argument from this fact, is seen when you consider that a balance struck between the salaries of the Latin schoolmaster in Boston and the grammar schoolmaster in Becket, does not help feed the Becket man's children. Because Boston pays her teachers fair salaries, the rest of the towns in the Commonwealth average theirs with hers, and, considering the result, congratulate the State on the progress of education and the fidelity of the children to the precious legacy of the fathers. The question is not now between teachers and other men, but between *successful* teachers and other men. Nowhere is success so much a matter of life and

death as in teaching. A successful teacher could succeed in any thing. A few eminent teachers receive \$3,500 per annum. But what banker, merchant, or engineer, — what minister or lawyer, — would be content if his yearly earnings for thirty years had averaged \$3,500? Men who fill these high places in teaching, hold them because they are *successful* men, and twice \$3,500 a year would not make their places pecuniarily as desirable as a merchant's in Washington Street.

But if *men* ought to be paid more, what shall be said of women? Let the best be said first. One woman, and only one, in the United States, receives a salary of \$2,000. This is the accomplished Principal of the St. Louis Normal School. One receives \$1,820, — the assistant in the California Normal School. The Principal of the Normal School at Framingham has \$1,500. Twenty teachers in San Francisco have \$1,400 each, reckoning gold at a premium of 40 per cent. It is considered unusual if a woman in the Eastern States receives \$900. The average compensation of female teachers in Massachusetts, applying the statistics of the Secretary to twelve months in a year, is — God save mark! — \$292.32. Last year, in many parts of Vermont, — a State which has on paper the best school system in the country, — teachers received from \$1.00 to \$1.50 less wages per week than

house-servants. Though it has been known for many years that some admirable women, in charge of private schools, have received a larger income than any yet mentioned, still people at large are astonished when they hear that a woman has \$900 in a public school. One act of justice must be done at once. Women must be paid better. Otherwise we shall wait another quarter century for the next advance step in elementary education.

Great advances have been made during the last fifty years; but Mr. Fraser, and, I think, De Tocqueville, noticed at once that this advance was rather in beauty of school architecture than in appreciation of the services of teachers.

I have thus far very imperfectly shown that the community regard teaching as a *business* rather than a profession; that there is a work to be done in this country by such a profession; and that work is to conserve and cultivate the science of education, to promote æsthetic culture, and, above all, to strengthen the foundation of our government in the broader intelligence of the people; that a profession of teaching should be recognized at once. To this end, all instructors should work together and help each other; examination of teachers should be by the Board of Education; the district system should be abolished; the number of desirable educational officers should be increased; the concentration prin-



ciple should be carried out in the graded system as far as possible ; the number of professional schools should be increased ; all teachers should be better paid : and finally, there should be a more thorough system of supervision and inspection.

These important topics have been treated solely in their relations to our theme.

It remains to suggest that something must be done by teachers themselves, in bringing about this most desirable consummation of their hopes and wishes.

From what has been said, it may be fairly inferred that teachers will be just as good as public opinion demands. The stimulus to self-culture will never be great from this source. But, loving the work as we do, convinced as we are that it is of vital consequence to the nation, may we not do much to improve ourselves, and so make the profession of teaching more and more indispensable ? Americans are not slow to recognize high achievements. The grandeur of our work is not impaired by the indifference of those who reap its benefits.

Fellow-teachers, — let us rouse ourselves to higher endeavors, to more thorough scholarship, to more exalted hopes ! The kind of scholarship required of us is peculiar. We cannot attain to eminence in any branch of *acquired* knowledge, except that of skilful and well-digested methods.

*How to teach*, we must study; how to stimulate, correct, reprove, and thoroughly ennoble our pupils. A great man has told us that a teacher must have in himself all that he would see re-appear in his pupils. Let us each bear with him, as a spell, St. Paul's hint to the young professor of preaching, "Let no man despise thee."

Let us keep ourselves in contact with the world at large. Let us keep in advance of our work, remembering Goëthe's profound saying, "Unless a man is a little *too good* for his work, he is not quite good enough for it."

Living men are wanted for the profession of teaching. No scholarship so thorough or complete, no taste so delicate, no enthusiasm so ardent, no love so strong, that it should not be consecrated to the service of public instruction.

Socrates and Plato, Longinus and Aristotle, were teachers. Why, in that elder day, to be a teacher was greater than to be a king. If a teacher be a *man* among *men*, a thinker and a *doer*, he will command respect. Shut out from rostrum and from pulpit, he may still temper the eloquence of the one, and put a nobler manhood into the other. Some one calls us short-lived suicides. Well! a short life, but a noble one!

Let us carry with us, as we leave this discussion, the true and loving words of the noblest of ideal

women : "When the hour of trouble comes to the mind or to the body, and when the hour of death comes, that comes to high and low, then it isna what we hae done for oursels, but what we hae done for ithers, that we think on maist pleasantly."

## LECTURE III.

---

### THE PLACE OF NATURAL HISTORY IN A COURSE OF INSTRUCTION.

BY ISAAC F. CADY.

AMONG some objects that I was, several years since, examining with the microscope, was the parachute of a dandelion seed. I had, of course, always been familiar with this interesting but neglected flower. In a pasture crossed by a footpath, there was a spot where they grew in unusual abundance. The cattle that grazed the pasture eagerly sought it when the suns of April first clothed the hill-sides with verdure. The closely-shaven grass, more thickly set in consequence of its early croppings, formed a carpet soft and beautiful as velvet. But, in spite of all this grazing, the dandelions grew there in such profusion that, when they came fully into bloom, they covered the ground as with a yellow snow-shower. The microscope revealed to me the means by which they succeeded in growing in a spot so unlikely to give them support. In my

childhood, I had often seen the seeds of this humble plant floating like little balloons in the air, in search of a place in which to grow. But, when I placed the little parachute, flattened between two slips of glass, in the focus of the microscope, a thrill ran tingling to my fingers' ends; for I then made the discovery that the Creator, when he planned the universe, had not forgotten to devise the most effective means for planting the seeds of a dandelion. Each of the diverging fibres that composed the fairy parachute, was barbed, from end to end, with spines directed towards the outer extremity; so that, when the seed had once fallen among the grass, every subsequent motion served to carry it further down towards the moist earth; while its myriads of barbs prevented the winds from driving it away.

We may regard this little specimen of study in natural history as an epitome of the general process. Curiosity is first excited. This leads to observation and the use of the perceptive powers. The discovery of an interesting fact calls into exercise the memory in such a way that it will never allow the fact to escape. The reason is called into action by the spontaneous inquiry, What purpose is subserved by the peculiarity of structure discovered? and there follows an irresistible conviction of intelligence and design in the author, attended by a feeling of reverential admiration of the Infinite

Being who gives equally careful attention to the minute as to the vast.

Most parts of this process are as possible for a child of five or six years of age as for an adult. Hence, the study of natural history is suited to the wants of pupils in our lowest grade of schools. It is adapted, more perfectly than any other branch of study, to the cultivation of habits of observation, which are not only of the most important character, but also are more easily and successfully formed in youth than at any other period. Curiosity is a prominent characteristic of the juvenile mind, and needs to be carefully directed to objects worthy of its exercise. Such objects are furnished without limit in the natural world, and are always accessible. They can be studied, too, in such a way as to prove no hindrance to the acquisition of other knowledge. In fact, they may be made an efficient means for its promotion.

I was much impressed, several years ago, by an account of the mode of teaching the alphabet by a teacher in one of the German gymnasia. It was given before this Institute, by Geo. B. Emerson, whose opinion in matters of education, I need not say, is a recognized authority. The teacher was represented as a man of thorough education and varied culture; and, for this reason, one of the most suitable teachers possible for children; for I



have much sympathy with the sentiment of Horace Mann, that the best teacher for the infant mind is the infinite mind. A class of pupils of the age of eight years, if I remember correctly, came in, each with slate and pencil, to receive their first lesson in reading.

The teacher began by drawing upon the black-board the outlines of a fish. In answer to the question, "What is this?" the pupils reply, "A fish."—"Think again; is this a fish?" asks the teacher. The pupils discover their mistake, and reply, "It is the picture of a fish."—"Is this a *picture* of a fish?" rejoins the teacher. After a little reflection, some pupil more ready than the rest, decides that it is not a picture, because it wants colors. The decision is finally reached, that the representation upon the board is a drawing of a fish. This fact the pupils are required to state, in a clear, well-articulated sentence. Then follows a discussion of the general characteristics of fishes; their structure, organs, mode of breathing, etc., and an enumeration of the various kinds of fishes which the pupils have seen, or of which they have heard. Then the teacher directs them to imitate upon their slates the drawing before them; and, having suitably commended or criticized their efforts, he carefully prints upon the board the word "fish," teaches them to call the word at sight, causes them to imitate it

upon their slates, and concludes the lesson by teaching the names of the separate letters, and the spelling of the word.

A lesson taught in this manner is a pleasure, and no drudgery. It will not be easily forgotten. The previous knowledge of the pupils has been brought into use, and a large amount of useful information has been added. The mind has been intelligently employed. The perceptive and imitative powers have been exercised, and the muscles have been trained to act in obedience to the will. The imagination has been quickened, the taste has been cultivated, and a good foundation has been laid for future progress, not only in reading, but also in general culture and development.

And what is there to hinder a course similar to this in all our primary schools? I would, however, when practicable, prefer real objects to be studied and imitated in drawing, both upon the board and the slate. Such objects are always accessible. They teach lessons of facts and not of fiction. The season of spring, in its unfolding wealth of vegetation, offers them, in herb and tree and flower, in such abundance that chance itself can scarcely make a wrong selection. The process of germination and growth from seeds, can be easily taught and illustrated. The development of leaves and flowers from the unfolding buds, together with their various

forms and uses ; the division of plants into annuals, biennials, and perennials ; the mode of growth in endogens and exogens ; the distinction between trees and shrubs, evergreen and deciduous trees, true roots and mere underground stems, — these and multitudes of other facts in the vegetable world, can be as well taught in a primary school as in a college, and be as intelligently learned by a child of six or eight years, as by the man of sixty. By pursuing the subject judiciously at intervals during the summer and autumn, the children in our schools, with a moderate expenditure of time, could, in a single season, gather a very desirable amount of botanical knowledge, which would greatly facilitate the prosecution of the study at some subsequent period, or which would, of itself, be of great value, should the subject receive no further specific attention. Besides this, the habits of attention and intelligent observation of the works of nature that would be induced, would open a perennial source of pure and rational enjoyment.

A similar course might be pursued in several other branches of science. The pupils themselves might be made excellent text-books for teaching the most important facts of animal physiology. In zoölogy, the horse, the ox, the sheep, the dog, the cat, and her peculiar victims, together with numerous other familiar animals and birds, can be made objects

of study, and become the means of fixing in the juvenile mind the leading characteristics of the various classes, orders, families, and genera, of the animal creation. No object in nature is without interest. Bees and beetles, caterpillars and worms, butterflies and spiders, when studied, are found to possess wonderful peculiarities; and, to one who has the embryo spirit of an Agassiz, a toad, or tortoise, or a humble clam, may be made an object of pleasant and profitable study.

More than twenty years ago, soon after leaving college, I visited a large manufacturing village to ascertain the prospects for a private school. Among those whom I was recommended to consult was a prominent manufacturing agent. He was a plain man, — plain in features, plain in apparel, and plain in his use of good common sense. I judge he claimed no extensive acquirements from books, yet he was by no means uneducated. This he evinced by his clear, practical modes of thinking. He inclined to disparage the common modes of teaching as being too abstract, and as lacking the practical element. He thought this extended even to arithmetic, and indicated some of the brief and direct methods by which he was accustomed to obtain results in mechanical calculations. He said that he wished to have his son taught that *this* was quartz and *that* mica; *this* granite and *that* sandstone; in

short, that he wished him to observe the objects with which we constantly meet in the world of nature, and to be able to recognize them at sight, and to call their names. Had not this plain man, of a quarter of a century ago, some tolerably correct notions of the true philosophy of education? and did he not show that, in quite an important sense, he was a well-educated man?

It may be objected to the method of teaching indicated, that it is unsystematic and fragmentary. Is this objection one of importance? So long as each object considered is complete by itself, and capable of being understood in its parts and their adaptations, is it a serious objection, for the juvenile mind, that its precise location in a scientific system is not apprehended? If so, it seems to me to be more than compensated by the fact that it leaves the mind unfettered to follow its instinctive tendencies in examining phenomena, and in accumulating information for future use. We must not forget that the perceptive faculties are particularly active in childhood and youth. Inquisitiveness is in every movement of the childish mind. It questions everything it meets. It acquires more facts during the first five years than perhaps during any subsequent ten of its existence. This tendency continues prominent to the age of ten or twelve years. This, then, is peculiarly a period for the collection of facts; and, as he that builds a

house finds no difficulty in the arrangement of his materials, provided they have been properly selected and in abundance, but causes the building to rise in harmonious and just proportions, so all these elements of knowledge gathered in childhood and youth, will, in maturer years, be brought easily and naturally into their appropriate relations in the building up of systematic science. Nothing in itself valuable will come amiss, or wait long to find its appropriate location. When the pupil's mind has attained that maturity which fits it for the work of abstraction, generalization, and classification, it will be of immense advantage to have an abundant store of materials already collected. These important processes will thus be facilitated, and all subsequent observation will be more discriminating and efficient. The reasoning powers will be called into salutary action in studying the purposes of special organic structures, the adaptation of means to ends, the mutual dependencies existing throughout the domains of nature; and all the most important faculties of the mind will be exercised and strengthened.

In a recent report, one of our prominent educators speaks as follows:—

“Elementary instruction, such as is given in our primary schools, must of necessity be, to a great extent, verbal and mechanical. The memory is the faculty first to be cultivated. It is upon this that



we have to depend, mainly, in leading the pupil to take the first steps in knowledge. But a wise teacher will aim constantly to awaken and cultivate, at the earliest period, the perceptive and reasoning powers of his pupils."

This is a good argument for the study of natural history for children. It indicates, in general, the chief object of primary instruction and the means of its accomplishment. The memory is to be cultivated by calling into exercise the perceptive faculties; and this is, to a great extent, to be done by oral instruction. In what way can this be so effectually accomplished, and with the introduction of less of the mere mechanical element, as by drawing instruction from natural objects? These call directly for observation and the exercise of the perceptive powers. Interest is awakened; the mind is made conversant with facts and not with unintelligible abstractions. Questionings will spontaneously arise and call for the exercise of the reasoning powers. Truth will be learned, and that in such a way that it will hardly fail to be remembered. *One* well-taught lesson from some suitable object in nature is worth more than a host of abstractions. I would rather a child should learn to distinguish by observation, a maple from an elm, and to recognize each by its general appearance and the structure of its leaves, than to define, ever so precisely, the latitude and longitude of Nova Zembla,

which for him can have no existence except in fancy, or to name the constellations of the Zodiac, from having learned them from a painted chart, whose resemblance to any portion of the real heavens is scarcely more than the shadow of a myth.

And this suggests a desirable change in the elementary studies of our schools. In the lower grades let natural history take the place of geography. This latter is a valuable and important study for the pupil whose development is sufficiently mature to insure its intelligible pursuit; but it is a question — or perhaps no question at all — whether much of the time, now spent upon it in our primary and intermediate schools, is not wasted and thrown away. Most of the subject that can be successfully studied in these schools, properly comes within the range of natural history. Selections from this latter study might be made to serve as a most excellent preparation for the pursuit of geography when the proper time for it should arrive. Some of the topics embraced in geography are sufficient to tax the maturest mind, and properly assign it a place among the advanced studies of our schools.

But shall instruction in natural history be exclusively oral, or shall we use books? In our lower grades of schools, the reading lessons might consist largely of descriptions in natural history. These, when read, should be illustrated by real objects. Of

these there should be a collection in every school, especially of such as are not readily accessible to the teacher and pupils. Of course, the descriptions should be supplemental from the resources of the teacher, who should always be, for the pupil, the best possible text-book. The lessons should be pursued in such a manner as to insure a clear understanding of the subjects, and should be reviewed sufficiently to fix all important facts permanently in the memory. Let the thoughts be clear and the language accurate and well chosen. Exercises of this kind, suitably conducted, in connection with lessons in spelling, printing, drawing, and simple operations in numbers, would be ample for the wants of our primary and intermediate schools.

Are there any books, suited to this method, accessible? Hooker's Child's Book of Nature, and Willson's Series of Readers, are, perhaps, better suited to it than any now before the public. If these are not the best possible, let the introduction of the study create the demand, and the supply will follow.

But when shall the study be suspended? Never! Its range is too broad for this: its nature too important. As a sequel to this earlier course in our schools, there should follow a systematic pursuit of the subject with the aid of a well-prepared text-book. This should precede physical geography, natural philosophy, botany, chemistry, and the other natural

sciences, and serve as an introduction to their pursuit.

Might not a considerable portion of the time spent with arithmetic in our schools, be more advantageously employed in natural science? Allowing the importance of arithmetic to be as great as any would care to claim, is not the amount of time it now receives, disproportionate and unnecessary? Might not the subject, if properly managed, be mastered in half the usual time? At five years of age our pupils are all studying arithmetic. At fifteen a large part of them are still engaged in arithmetic. And yet most of us, probably, are acquainted with those who have so mastered the subject in a single year, or less, as to be able readily to solve all the problems of the current text-books. In fact, had not some of these, without being either Colburns or Saffords, in this time developed an ability in mathematical reasoning greater than that generally exhibited by our pupils, after from five to ten years of cyphering? If this is even proximately true, it suggests that much valuable time might be saved by a more judicious arrangement.

I will not now stop to inquire to what extent the suggestions given respecting arithmetic might also apply to grammar. Both the *time* in many instances, spent upon this latter, as well as the modes of pursuing it, are very proper subjects for discussion.

I have already indicated that the study of natural history is worthy of a prominent place in our schools, not only on account of its adaptation to the tendencies of the juvenile mind, and for the development of the perceptive and reasoning faculties, but also as a means of general culture. Where else shall we go for more effective influences for the culture and refinement of taste, the elevation of moral character, and the promotion of pure enjoyment? If beauty can refine the taste, then nature affords the most abundant means. It teems in all her walks. It glitters in the mountain gem, and in the pearls of ocean. It blushes in the flowers of spring and in the autumn fruits. It sparkles in the crystals of winter's snow, and shines resplendent in the varying hues of bird and insect that glance in the sunshine of summer's green hills and wooded slopes, the desert wastes and cultivated fields, meadows crossed by winding threads of silver, mountains burnished with early sunbeams, oceans and rivers, lakes, hills, and plains, are all fraught with infinite beauty for him that hath an eye to see. These give to the poet's soul its purest inspiration. As he roams amid

"Old trees, tall oaks and gnarled pines,  
That stream with gray-green mosses,"

he holds communion with the spirit of heaven-born liberty.

—“The gifted bards  
Have ever loved the calm and quiet shades.”

For them there is an eloquent voice in all

“The sylvan pomp of woods, the golden sun,  
The flowers, the leaves, the river on its way;  
Blue skies and silver clouds and gentle winds;  
The swelling upland where the sidelong sun,  
Aslant the wooded slope at evening goes;  
Mountain and shattered cliff, and sunny vale.”  
As his own child the poet “loves the flower,”  
And “in the ragged burr can beauty see.

Why should not the children in our schools be  
taught to drink from these pure fountains, and with  
the poet, to find

“Tongues in trees, books in the running brooks,  
Sermons in stones, and good in every thing”?

And may we not hope that the day is near when  
it will not be regarded as a waste of time for our  
teachers to sometimes lead forth their charge and  
teach them lessons from nature’s ever-open book,  
under the blue sky, where they may drink in health  
at once for body, heart, and soul?

Before a different audience, it would not be  
proper to omit the consideration of natural history  
as a source of material wealth. A word must now  
suffice. At present, no single product of the min-  
eral world is comparable in importance with coal;



and in time to come, this must be more emphatically true. What would our iron, far the most indispensable of metals, soon be worth, were it not for our beds of coal? And yet, as has been remarked by another, "In searching for it, millions of dollars have been thrown away in boring rocks in which a pound of it could never be found." Now it is found in exhaustless measures, where chance alone could never have discovered it. Why is this? It is because the naturalist has learned to read the records inscribed upon the strata of the earth. And whence are many of our choicest fruits, our most indispensable articles of food, the colors that please the eye, and the medicines that can heal our physical maladies? Wherever the sail of commerce or of discovery has sought some region hitherto unexplored, either in tropic heats or midst the polar snows, the naturalist has been there to gather all things new, to learn their nature, and to test their worth. He is ever on the alert, with glass and hammer. To him the silver and the gold unlock their treasures; and at his bidding, the little poisonous and bitter root becomes the staff of life to millions.

See yonder boy amusing himself with soap-bubbles. His teachers call him dull; yet he finds pleasure in watching those fragile globes clad in evanescent rainbows. Hereafter, when the apple

falls, he shall be the first to ask it why it fell. And, in the echoes of the answer it shall return, he will hear music which, as yet, has never fallen on the ear of mortals; for it is none other than the eternal harmony of the spheres.

Near the barren shores of Cornwall, several years ago, some English gentlemen noticed an unpromising lad swinging upon a gate. But his soul was alive to the voice of nature. As he wanders on the beach one day, he finds an old, rejected clyster apparatus. In the hands of the somewhat uncouth boy, it finds a use its author never dreamed of. Still later, a few plates of copper and of zinc, under his manipulation, make wondrous revelations, and force asunder the elements of substances so closely wedded that no alchymic skill had yet availed to detect their individual existence. A new era dawns upon the world of science. The chair of the Royal Institution receives its most distinguished occupant, and the miner, as he walks fearless and unharmed through magazines of destruction, invokes blessings on the name of Davy.

And who is that fatherless youth, an almost unrestrained wanderer upon the rocky shores of Scotland? Under the village school dame, he has made the "grand acquirement of his life;" for he has learned to read. Henceforth, he will be mostly nature's pupil. He has read "Jack the Giant-

Killer," "Aladdin and his Wonderful Lamp," "Gulliver's Travels," "Robinson Crusoe," and the "Pilgrim's Progress." He must earn his own subsistence, and hence is taught to wield the mason's hammer. One day, when his fellow-laborers are at rest after their mid-day meal, he strolls away to spend his half-hour's intermission upon a mossy knoll in a neighboring wood, which, through the trees, commands a wide prospect of the bay and shore. Not a wrinkle is on the water; no cloud is on the sky. The branches of the trees are still as though traced on canvas. Ben Nevis rises on the west, "white with the yet unwasted snows of winter, sharply defined in the clear atmosphere, as if all its sunny slopes and blue retiring hollows had been chiselled in marble." And so his half-hour passes in delightful contemplation of nature's loveliness. Ah! *his* is more than a mere mechanic's soul! Some blow of his shall yet discover the *finger-prints*, as well as the foot-prints, of the Creator; and he shall interpret them to the wondering ears of future generations.

Seventy-two thousand francs for the library of a naturalist! And, at this price, an excellent bargain for the government of France. And what price shall be set upon the Cabinet of Comparative Anatomy in the *Jardin des Plantes*? Cuvier, educated for the Christian ministry, while director of Protes-

tant worship, himself scarcely less a preacher for his devotion to the works of nature. Edwards, as a boy watching spiders journeying through the air upon balloons of their own construction, and writing the results of his observations to men of science beyond the ocean—scarcely less a naturalist for being one of the greatest theologians of his age; while, in his favorite solitude upon the banks of the Hudson, he hangs a prayer upon every thorn of the tree by which he kneels.

And what means that row of stakes athwart the Alpine glacier? The world now knows comparatively little of him who placed them there; but he has caught the true spirit of the motto "Excelsior!" as it came ringing down from the heights above. Henceforth, his time is too valuable to be spent in making money. Napoleons cannot buy him. He is studying lessons of wonderful sublimity; and he shall hereafter tell you, with the certainty of prophetic inspiration, how the earth emerged from chaos, and that the New World is the oldest world on earth.

Why should not the student of nature be an enthusiast? It is fanaticism that demands our condemnation. Enthusiasm in what is good commends itself to our approval. And why should not the naturalist be devout? By becoming familiar with their works, we hold communion with the gifted and

the good among our fellow-men, and imbibe something of their spirit. So, in studying the works of nature, we learn the better to understand, admire, and adore their author; for each object in her wide domain is but a thought of God.

Fellow-teachers, — can we not each do something to infuse into our pupils the spirit of a Newton, a Davy, a Miller, or an Agassiz? And, while we endeavor to train their intellectual and moral powers by the best means at our disposal, can we not, by drawing their attention wisely to the things which the Almighty has made “beautiful in their time,” as well as good, cause them to become more devout and intelligent worshippers in his vast and holy temple?

## LECTURE IV.

---

### READING: STYLES AND METHODS.

BY Z. RICHARDS.

IN this paper I propose to confine myself to the three points suggested by the language of the subject for discussion.

#### 1. Reading.

What, then, is reading? If I were to consider this audience as a class of my pupils, I would call upon each of you to give a written, categorical answer. What answer would you give? As I cannot call for, or expect answers to be given here, it may not be proper for me to give any of the different answers, which I suppose would be given. I presume that you will all admit, that hardly any two would agree. We may safely conclude that the answers would widely differ, not only in form and language, but in meaning; some of which might be instructive, and others amusing. It is somewhat interesting to notice the number of persons who are ready to criticize readers, and give their opinions as to what makes a



good reader. How often is the remark made, that "there are few good readers"! Of course, those who make the remark must consider themselves good critics, if not good readers.

But to the question, "What is reading?" I will venture to give an answer; and then ask those who are not pleased with it, to give one which suits them better.

Reading, as a branch of school training, is *learning how to use and understand language*.

Language is the great storehouse of knowledge. In written language is locked up the intellectual treasures, collected by the labor, the skill, and the genius of past generations; and *the scholar's chief work is to find out what this storehouse contains*. Aside from personal experience and observation, it is to written language, as the treasury of knowledge, we are to look for the enlightening and educating power of the world. Words and sentences are the locks and the keys to this vast treasury of knowledge. The child learns to read in order that he may be able to have ready access to these rich treasures.

To be able to read *well*, then, is to have the power of acquiring knowledge. He who *truly reads* makes the thoughts of others his own; he secures for his own use the results of the study and investigation of the most reliable and profound thinkers of all ages. We may go further and say, that, to be-

come a *good* reader is to become a good scholar ; for he who fails in reading will fail in every branch of school training. But he is not necessarily a good reader, who can call words fluently and distinctly, and "mind his stops," though these qualities may belong to a good *oral* reader ; neither is a rapid and voluminous reader necessarily a good reader. But as good reading necessarily implies a correct understanding of what is read, we may first define a good *silent* reader to be one, who, after running his eyes carefully over the words of an author, comprehends clearly and readily just what and all the author intended to convey ; and a good *oral* reader, to be one who can so utter the words of an author, as to convey his full meaning to those who listen. Both these characteristics are essential requisites in training pupils to read. In oral reading, there is something more necessary, than to convey the full meaning of an author to those who listen, inasmuch as perfection in this exercise requires that the meaning should be given in the most agreeable, forcible, and appropriate manner.

For a few years past more than usual attention has been given to what is called oratorical reading. Some good has been done, doubtless, by lectures and recitations before teachers ; for, if nothing more has been done, a new interest in regard to the importance of the subject may have been awakened. We

have been served with some fine specimens of dramatic and theatrical reading ; some new versions of Shakspeare, and some new phonetic evolutions, which may have possibly split open the heads of some modern Jupiters, and produced a few full-armed orators, in the estimation of their admirers. Perhaps I am somewhat "old foggyish" and sceptical ; yet I am inclined to think that these elocutionary lectures and phonetic gyrations have just about as much to do in making good readers in our schools, as learned and elaborate lectures upon the fine arts, agriculture, and even shoemaking, would have, in making good painters, sculptors, farmers, and shoemakers. Who could become a good tailor or shoemaker by listening to learned lectures, and by watching the motions of the needle and the awl ! It is a humiliating fact, that very few of the fine scholars of our country, even the graduates of our colleges, are what may be called good oral readers, and good speakers. Their defects may be owing, *in part*, to the want of proper training in the higher institutions, but chiefly to the miserable training they received while learning to utter and articulate the elementary sounds of our alphabet in their various combinations, and to the senseless manner in which they have been trained to pronounce and use words in learning to read.

The next point in this discussion relates to *method*

in teaching to read. What, then, is the *best method* in teaching to read? There is no question connected with school training of more importance than this; and yet so little has it been regarded, by almost everybody, that hitherto, the youngest, and often the most inexperienced and unskilled teachers have been assigned to this work; and, what is quite as strange and unreasonable, only a very small portion of the time allotted to school is devoted to this most important part of school training. Even this small portion of time is spent in hurrying over this exercise, as though it were a meaningless task, to be laid aside as soon as possible, like a useless garment.

I do not propose to discuss the merits of the *phonic* method, the *word* method, or the *alphabetic* method, as an exclusive method; because they all have merits which should be regarded in determining the *best* method. One of the first principles to be regarded in determining upon the best method of teaching to read is, that, *to make good readers and speakers, we must begin with the child as soon as he begins to utter elementary sounds and words, and to learn their meaning*; bearing in mind always, that good reading does not consist alone in uttering words and sounds correctly; for this a parrot may do; but, as far as possible, every word learned, every combination of words, and every new or varied form of any word, should convey a new

and correct idea to the mind of the pupil. Any method of teaching the child to read which does not recognize and exemplify the principles in the above statement, is sadly defective, and will fail to make good readers. A disregard of these principles is the grand cause why so many teachers fail in teaching children. It is not extravagant to say that nine tenths of the children, when they first learn to utter words contained in a primary reader, gain but little more intelligence therefrom than parrots, — being *mere word repeaters*. In fact, the first lessons in most of our primary readers, and the directions given for their use, only serve to perpetuate this senseless and unreasonable practice. One of our most popular primary readers introduces the words *as, so, go, no*, as the first words to be learned by the child ; simply because they have two letters, though they are the most senseless words in the language. Another author selects words to represent the different sounds of some vowel ; and nearly all select words without regard to the condition or wants of the child. Fortunate is the child if he finds a teacher who knows enough to introduce sense and thought where none was intended ; but more fortunate would he be, if he could find both teacher and books adapted to his wants.

Believing that the principal errors in learning the

meaning and use of language take their origin in the first efforts of the child in learning to read, I am inclined to offer a few suggestions in reference to the manner of giving first instructions. I do not claim that any method which I may propose will be perfect, or free from objections, nor that it will be altogether new; yet I think I can claim that it will do something towards reducing to a system the various, unsatisfactory, and conflicting methods now in use.

For the first lessons of the *abecedarian*, I would select a class of words of the simplest form, without silent letters, which should be the names of such objects as are familiar, and capable of being presented to the senses of the children; and which should contain, in one or more forms, every alphabetic character, and, as far as possible, every elementary sound. Until the names of all the characters are learned, I would select and use only such words as have but one of the sounds of each of the vowel characters; as *cat, bat, rat, pan, man; bed, net, hen, peg; pin, pig, fig, lip; fox, pot, hog, ox; bug, gun, nut, drum.*

For illustration, I will take the word *cat*, familiar to every child. I would require the child to pronounce it after me as perfectly as possible; then I would be sure that the child understands the meaning of the word by the aid of the thing rep-



resented, or by its picture, as well as by the letters of its name; then I would give, and require the child to give, each elementary sound represented in the word, and repeat it until it can be readily given as accurately as possible; then I would give, and require each child to give, the name of each letter representing each sound.

The above exercise is given as a specimen for as many words of the above description as are necessary to make them familiar with the names of all letters, and of as many sounds as possible.

Again: When the child has thoroughly learned the names of all the letters in the alphabet, and is able to give the sounds they represent in the simple words selected, I would proceed to combine these same words with other words which would predicate some action; as, *bats fly, hens lay, foxes run, nuts fall*, etc. These simple phrases should be read and repeated until the child can readily call the words at sight, and in every position. Constant care must be taken to require clear and correct enunciation of all sounds, and proper tones, which should be so varied as to express the particular meaning and thought; as, for instance, *bats fly*. The teacher should ask, What fly? Answer, Bats fly. Again, What do bats do? Bats fly. Be sure that the child answers the question by reading the words with the proper tone and emphasis. Pur-

sue this course with each and every combination of words. Abstract and uncommon words should not be used *at first*; and afterwards, by making the pupil overcome one difficulty at a time.

Again: In the next stage of progress, combine with the name and predicate modifying words; as, *wild bats fly swiftly*. Require the proper tones and emphasis, as the child reads, in reply to any one of the following questions: Bats fly. What fly? Bats fly. What kind of bats fly? Wild bats fly. What do wild bats do? Wild bats fly. How do wild bats fly? Wild bats fly swiftly.

Exercises of this kind may be introduced and varied to almost any extent, and new elements added from time to time, as the pupil progresses. In this way he will be made to feel that every change in the form of a word, and every additional word, involves a new meaning; and, at the same time, he will learn to modify his tones in reading aloud, according to the change in the meaning.

The foregoing remarks, though crude and unelaborated, may prove enough to show what I consider the basis of a correct method of teaching reading; for, if the plan thus indicated be accurately carried out, the child will be thoroughly trained in all the essential characteristics of good reading; such as will secure a distinct and correct enunciation, proper pronunciation, inflection, and

modulation of the voice, appreciation and classification of words according to their meaning and use, with a clear and correct understanding of the meaning of language. When these characteristics are attained, the pupil is prepared for success in every branch of study which he may undertake.

With regard to the method of teaching the more advanced classes in reading, I would remark, that while it may not be necessary to carry out the method above indicated in all its minuteness, yet the general principles laid down for *first* lessons should be observed in advanced exercises, with such modifications as the qualifications of the pupil will naturally suggest ; which should be indicated in the arrangement of the reading books used.

Let this rule be universally and rigidly observed : *that no reading lesson should be closed or laid aside, until the teacher has exhausted his skill and efforts, if necessary, not only to make the pupil himself understand the meaning of what he reads, but to read in such a manner as to make his hearers understand.*

Some may object to the rigid observance of this rule, because it would prevent the pupils from reading the voluminous series of reading books prepared for the schools of the present day. It is true, they could not read through so many books as they are now required to do ; but they would *actually read more*, because they would *understand more* of what they do read.

In how many of the best taught schools of our favored country could the reading classes, after reading a lesson once in the ordinary way, close their books, and give, in their own language, the real meaning of what they had read? Select the best grammar school in the country, and call up the best class in the school to read, with only this direction, "Give us your best specimen of reading;" and after they have done so, ask any one, or all, to give you a full and clear statement of the meaning of the portion read; and if, in nine cases out of ten, you do not meet with a failure, your experience will be different from my own.

In regard to *style* in reading, it may be said to depend chiefly upon the *method* adopted in teaching and learning to read *orally*. But, as nine tenths of our reading is not oral, and, as nine tenths of our scholars will not become public speakers or public readers, it is evident that we must have a higher and more prominent regard to the *meaning* of the language, than to its *style* of delivery. While it should be the teacher's aim and effort to regard the style of delivery, and give a thorough and correct training of the vocal powers, there is a higher and more important end to gain, by training the child so that he may get a *clear, quick*, and comprehensive idea of the meaning of what he reads. Hence the importance of the rule above given.

Here I will say what would have been better said under the head of method ; that it is a great mistake for the teacher to rely upon the book in hand, while listening to a reading exercise. If the teacher has done his duty by previously studying and getting a proper understanding of the reading lesson, he needs no book while listening to the reader. He should require the child to read in such a manner that not only he, but every scholar in the class, and every listener, can understand clearly and easily what is read. A common exercise should be to require the class to listen with closed books while one scholar is reading, and afterwards to give the meaning of what was read, in their own, but in correct language. In fact, the teacher cannot so well judge of the style of reading, while his eyes are confined to his book.

As regards enunciation, articulation, tones, inflections, and modulation of the voice, I think I have already made it sufficiently clear to your minds, that the time and place for training in these particulars, is when the child is first learning to read.

It is here, perhaps, more than anywhere else, that we meet the great difficulty which stares us in the face, whenever we consider the responsible work of teaching ; viz., the want of proper training, proper qualifications, and experience, on the part of those who are usually called upon to give the first instructions in reading.

In view of what has been said, it must be evident that *style* depends mainly upon two considerations: *first, habits of thought*, which themselves depend upon early training; and, *secondly*, upon the *example* of the teacher. If the child has been trained in a thoughtless, senseless, and, consequently, monotonous and sing-song style of reading his first lessons, it will be very difficult to break up such habits in after years; but if, on the contrary, his mind has been brought into quick and active exercise, so as to have a keen and ready perception of the meaning of what he reads; and, if he has had a training of the voice in reference to it, you will find his style of reading vastly superior to that of the children trained in the too common way of drawling, singing, and mumbling the important words they utter. I need only refer you to the very common scenes exhibited in most of our primary schools, which the pen cannot describe, but which must be seen and heard in order to be appreciated.

But how shall thought be awakened, in learning to read the almost senseless combinations of letters and words, which are so generally given as the first examples for training children to read? What sense or interest can the child have in combining the letter *b*, to *a, e, i, o, u*; or the almost equally senseless words, *so, go, no, up, he, it, to, in, be, my*, etc.? A teacher must have extraordinary ingenuity and skill,



if he can awaken thought and interest in children, by introducing them at first, to such signs of thought as these.

But we will take a not very suggestive sentence or two to illustrate how thought and interest may be awakened; as, "It is my hat;" "It is a tin box." Here, too, we find the pen quite inadequate to give the illustration we wish. We must suppose the children are able to call the words readily; and then we would ask, with a hat in our hand, "What is this? Whose hat is this? What do we use hats for? What are hats made of?" A similar course should be pursued with every sentence, and every combination of words, so as to make the children see that every word has a meaning. Children trained to the habit of *thinking* of the meaning of each word will be most likely to be interested, and, at the same time, give such an utterance of the words used, as to show that they know and perceive the meaning.

But the next, and not the least consideration in regard to style in reading, is the controlling influence of example. Children will generally learn to read as their teachers read. The elocutionist may give lessons until doomsday, but if the teacher cannot, or does not, exemplify the principles of a good style, in his own reading, at all times, all the elocutionary lessons are like water spilt upon a rock. If

the teacher reads in a monotonous, sing-song, senseless style, so will the pupil ; if, again, he reads with a variation of tones not suggested by the sense, so will the pupil.

It is an important question, how far representation by action or gestures should be carried in school training. I do not hesitate to say, however, that some of the peculiarities of some public speakers and readers, and even teachers of elocution, do not strike me as necessary, or even appropriate for school training. Energy, life, ease, fluency, appropriate tones and inflections, and a moderate adaptation of action and sound to sense, are all desirable, and should be tastefully cultivated ; but when we come to representation by scowls, shrugs of the shoulders, sudden starts, wild staring of the eyes, stamping, screaming, crying, laughing, howling, low indistinct and inarticulate gutturals, I am inclined to look upon them as inappropriate at least, if not belonging to the "abominable" in style.

It is a safe rule to be observed, I think, in reference to example in reading, or in teaching reading, that only such action and representation should be practised, as would be considered appropriate by highly cultivated people, in the family and in the common transactions of life. Neither the theatre nor the political rostrum is to be taken as a model for our schools.

I will close this essay with a few suggestions.

1st. It must appear evident to all that the teachers of our primary schools should have a more specific training in reference to giving instructions in reading and language. They need that training which results from intelligent experience. They should be acquainted with the principles which serve to give a natural and healthful development to all the powers of the mind; they should have a thorough knowledge of our language, and they should be trained in the science and art of teaching, under the direction of a master in the profession. Instead of putting the most inexperienced teachers into our primary schools, we should seek for those who have had the most experience, and who have the most appropriate qualifications; and then the *properly qualified* primary teacher should receive the most liberal compensation for services rendered. The primary teacher is the architect of the scholarship of his pupils; and if he is a competent and experienced architect he should receive the highest compensation for his services.

2d. In order to ascertain the qualifications of persons who desire to become teachers, they should pass an examination, not only in reference to the particular class of school which they are expected to teach; but the examination should have *three tests* of qualification, in all cases.

The tests should be as follows: 1st. An *oral*

*examination*, somewhat after the usual manner. 2d. A written examination, such as is now quite common; and, 3d. An *experimental* or *practical examination*, which, so far as I know, is not required anywhere, as a condition upon which the engagement is to be made.

This experimental examination should consist of exercises which would exhibit to the examiners the ability and tact of the candidate to conduct the usual recitations of the school, in one or more studies. We judge of the qualifications of a physician or of a lawyer, by their success in practice, and not by their knowledge of the books which treat of their professions. So the teacher should be required to furnish a specimen of his ability to instruct, and conduct the exercises of a class.

3d. I think it is evident that primary reading books are needed which are better adapted to the true and natural method of teaching reading, and of giving a thorough knowledge of language. If the number of series of reading books, and the number of books in each series, were all that is needed, we should not want any more for the next generation.

We conclude, then, that when we have *properly qualified primary teachers*, and properly prepared primary reading books, we may look for a more correct development of the mental powers of children, and a more comprehensive and thorough scholarship.

## LECTURE V.

---

### THE FOUNDERS OF THE INSTITUTE, AND ITS FIRST PRESIDENT.

BY ELBRIDGE SMITH, ESQ.

MR. PRESIDENT, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN,—

IN the moral and in the material world, in the progress of society, and in the course of nature, there are times when the great forces which move mind and matter seem to take on an unwonted activity, and give rise to unusual phenomena. These periods we call ages or eras. They give rise to new forms of life; they turn thought into new channels; they become the great landmarks in the history of the earth and its inhabitants; they mark, by well-defined limits, the bounds which separate the new from the old, the obsolete organizations and forms, which have done their work, from the higher activities and agencies which have become necessary in the development of the great plan of the Creator. Hence, we have, in geology,

our Silurian and Devonian periods, the reigns of fishes, reptiles, and mammals. And in the historic period, in the reign of man, we find, marked by equally sharp outlines, the great phases of our moral and intellectual progress. Such were the ages of Pericles and Augustus, of Bacon and Newton. In all these climacteric epochs, it is interesting to notice how closely the germs of new life seem to be infolded in the organizations that have reached their limits. The antagonism which often appears to exist between the new and the old is only apparent, not real. The true relation is rather of cause and effect. The teachings of Socrates were the necessary result of the barren philosophies and worthless wisdom of his fellow-sophists. The new method of Bacon came not as the creation of a single mind, but rather as the demand of mankind, wearied by the fruitless rounds of Aristotelian and scholastic logic. The great generalization of Newton was reached, not because the fall of an apple was a new phenomenon, but because a generation had arisen which demanded a better explanation than the Cartesian *vortices* could give. And so in the greatest of all eras, when Rome had trodden the nations into hopeless submission beneath the march of her legions, in one of the remotest provinces of the empire, unheard and unheeded in the palace of the Cæsars, the voice of one crying in the wilder-



ness was heard not so much as a result of the oppression of Rome, as from the desire of all nations for a reign of righteousness and truth. The old civilization was hastening to decay ; the fulness of time had come ; existing forms of political and religious life had reached their growth ; and, without the parade or the alarms of war, a new force was quietly introduced, by which the prejudices of the synagogue and the doubts of the academy, the pride of the portico, the fasces of the lictor, and the swords of thirty legions were humbled in the dust.

I have been led to these remarks, because you have made it my duty at this hour to speak of an era in American history, and of the men who marked it. I need not say to this audience, that the first quarter of the present century, and more especially the second and third decades, form an era in the history of New England and America, and, indeed, of the world as well. It was not until after the peace of Paris, in 1815; that our national life fairly and distinctively began. It is not without reason that the war of 1812 has been styled "the second war of independence." The war of the Revolution, the formation and adoption of the Constitution, almost a war with France, two domestic insurrections, the constantly threatening aspect of European politics, a war with Algiers,

and, at last, a second conflict with the mother country, were sufficient to fix the attention and tax the energies of the nation for forty years. Its history, during this period, was rather that of the infant Hercules struggling with the serpents in his cradle, than what we now see, — the youthful giant going forth to perform upon the broad continent greater labors than those imposed by Eurystheus. The period of which I am speaking was, then, the time to which we are to look for the rise of those institutions which have become distinctively American. The nation was now to set up for itself; its internal life and its external relations were to be shaped and adjusted. With the natural resources of a continent as yet scarcely touched; with a spirit of self-control and self-reliance, which the civilized world had been compelled to admire; with no constraint from the spiritual and temporal bonds which long centuries of civil and ecclesiastical misrule had imposed upon Europe; no feudal forms or vested rights; with no Bourbons nor Hapsburgs, no Guelfs nor Ghibellines, no Stuarts nor Tudors; no privileged church to check the free religious growth of the people; no haughty prelates to frown upon every fresh manifestation of Christian life and principle; no iron creed to mould into tame conformity the thoughts which the human soul may cherish of its Maker; no cloistered halls nor chartered uni-

versities, no endowed schools nor monastic retreats, where exploded theories, absurd customs, and false philosophies, are guarded from the influence of progressive thought — those intellectual catacombs, where the dead are kept with pensioned guardians to protect them, and affirm that they are still alive — with the garnered wisdom of all preceding generations to guide

“The heir of all ages in the foremost files of time;”

these were the auspices under which the national life was to begin, and the foundations of the new world's civilization to be laid. It was, in fact, a realization of the bright vision which George Berkeley saw a hundred years before, when he visited New England, foretold what it was to become, and bore an honorable part in hastening its accomplishment: —

“In happy climes, the seat of innocence,  
Where nature guides, and virtue rules, —  
Where men shall not impose for truth and sense,  
The pedantry of courts and schools, —

There shall be sung another golden age,  
The rise of empire and of arts;  
The great and good inspiring epic rage,  
The wisest heads and noblest hearts;

Not such as Europe breeds in her decay, —  
Such as she bred when fresh and young,  
When heavenly flame did animate her clay,  
By future poets shall be sung.”

But the condition of the country, at the period of which I am speaking, was not merely negative ; it was not simply free from the great barriers which checked human progress in Europe. There were positive influences at work which were destined to give rise to institutions and organizations which were to direct the American mind through centuries and round the globe.

The eighteenth century, more perhaps than any one of the preceding seventeen, had tended to enlarge and liberalize human thought. It produced, indeed, no Shakspeare, no Milton, no Bacon ; but it gave birth to Voltaire, Rousseau, and the Encyclopedists. There was no Reformation like that of the sixteenth, no Thirty Years' War, and, until its very close, no Great Rebellion or Revolution like those of the seventeenth century. The thoughts which occupied the foremost minds concerned not so much the government and faith of the Church as its very existence ; not so much the forms of Christian faith as its very essence. The political strife, earnest as it was ; the wars of succession, though they shook every throne in Europe, were far less fatal in their consequences than the subtle theories of human rights and human obligation, which were clothed with all the fascinations of genius and scattered broadcast through the world.

Whatever line of thought or action we may follow

in the eighteenth century, we notice the same convergence to a single result — the better appreciation and firmer establishment of the rights of man. The political and military history tend strongly in this direction. The war of the Spanish succession with which the century opened, effectually humbled the French monarchy which had so seriously threatened the liberties of Europe. The war of the Austrian succession gained nothing for France, but brought prominently to view in Prussia a Protestant power that was to act an important part in the future of European history. The Seven Years' War soon followed, and placed Prussia among the foremost European States, and gave North America to the dominion of Protestantism. France indulged in the luxury of revenge for the injuries which she had suffered from England, and freed the North-American colonies from all European control. The independence of America with the characters which it developed and brought to view, gave increased force to the political theories which had for years swayed the literary circles of Paris. The crisis which the wise had long foreseen, could no longer be delayed. The positive teachings of philosophy united their influence to the negative teachings of the church and state. From throne and altar, from monarch and prelate, the people had learned what government should not be, and what Christianity was not. They confounded Chris-

tianity with churchianity (if I may use the term), and turned to philosophy for the guidance which religion refused to give. The result was the temporary abolition of both throne and altar, until men learned a second time what Paul told them ages before, that the world by wisdom knew not God.

The French monarchy fell, and with it the peace of Europe for twenty-five years. Philosophy had its day, and did great good by the freedom and energy which it gave to human thought and action. It consigned to oblivion many of the shams which had deluded mankind for ages. It showed conclusively that a throne was made of pine boards, and covered with velvet; that an altar was the work of the cabinet-maker; and that a priest is nothing but a man, and he often a bad one, dressed up by the tailor and the mantua-maker. It showed also that it had nothing to give mankind which could fill the place of the ten commandments, or the sermon on the mount; and having shown its impotence to meet the highest wants of mankind, it retired to its proper sphere, leaving the nations still to follow prophets and apostles and build upon the sure foundation stone.

But there were other causes in operation which must be noticed. Franklin had tamed the lightning, Priestly had found his "dephlogisticated air," Galvani had noticed a spasm in the muscles of a dead frog (the force that caused it now sends the thoughts of



Europe and America in the twinkling of an eye through the eternal silence and darkness of fifteen hundred miles of ocean); Hargreaves had learned how to spin; the Rev. Edmund Cartwright had shown his spiritual descent from the tent-maker of Tarsus by teaching how to weave; James Watt had substituted muscles of iron for muscles of flesh; boys and girls, men and women, with less labor were to have a far greater reward; the cost of wholesome clothing was diminished *two thirds*; man was to have time for the culture of his mind; and, what is more directly to our purpose, while generals and field-mars-hals were leading to their Blenheims and Fontenoy's, their Leipsics and Waterloos, the flower of European states, there were men in the valleys of Switzerland and on the plains of Germany, — there were Oberlins and Pestalozzis, Krüsis and Fellenbergs, who were teaching the world to how much better use a boy might be applied than to be made a soldier, — were teaching this great lesson, that the training of the souls of a generation to knowledge and virtue may possibly take rank on a level with teaching them to shoulder arms and blow each other to pieces with gunpowder.

The eighteenth century, then, had wrought out the elements of a far higher social order, and a far better public economy. By humbling royal houses, it had taught them wisdom; by enlightening the

people, it had prepared the way for subjects to become citizens; the distance between the extremes of society was greatly lessened. Monarchy had had its day, sacerdotalism had had its day, feudal lords had had their day, and MAN was now to have his day. A vast continent had been reserved for the crisis; its virgin soil had been sparsely colonized by the best blood of the Huguenots and Puritans; the population of Europe had been sifted for two hundred years to furnish the adventurers who were to lay the foundations of empire in America; and when, in 1815, the eighteenth century closed (for it did close then, if we bound it by events rather than years); when the nations of Europe solemnly and gladly agreed to be at peace; when the temple of Janus was shut, and the dread enginery of war was laid up to repose for thirty years in the arsenals of Europe, it was natural that the period should be termed the "*era of good feeling*," — that the re-action after almost a half-century of war should be followed by an equal devotion to the arts of peace.

We find, accordingly, that in the fifteen years that followed the peace of Paris, the foundations of nearly all the great charities and enterprises which now absorb the benefactions of the country were laid. The several mission boards, foreign and domestic, whose influence has been felt

"From Greenland's icy mountains  
To India's coral strand;"

the American Peace Society, that has done so much towards beating swords into ploughshares and spears into pruning-hooks; the American Temperance Society, which stemmed the tide which was undermining the strength of the nation; the Prison Discipline Society, which looked upon the criminal and the outcast, and brought them within the sphere of Christian sympathy; the American Bible Society, whose field is the world; the American Education Society, whose aim has been to improve the churches by improving their ministers; the American Tract Society, which aimed to express in catholic words the doctrines and practice of the Christian church, — these were the organized forms into which the moral and religious activity of this period resolved itself, and which have made their influence felt throughout the Christian world.

While these great enterprises were springing into life, there were men at work on a still more catholic basis, — men, some of whom had sat at the feet of the best teachers of Europe, and all of whom had drank largely of their spirit, — men who were possessed as with a kind of inspiration, with the idea that America must be educated.

Had you visited Harvard College in 1819 or 1820, you might have seen two undergraduates, of riper age and more thoughtful aspect than the great majority of their fellow-students, sitting sometimes

in earnest discussion for hours, and sometimes strolling away in quiet communion, with their minds still bent upon great subjects. Their classmates thought they were discussing metaphysics, and this may have sometimes been the case; at any rate you may be sure they were not debating, nor betting upon the chances of the next base-ball match, nor of the Worcester regatta. These young men had fought their way through poverty to college, and were much more anxious for the culture of their minds than for the development of their muscle. They were under the instruction, in part, of a college tutor who still lives to participate with us in the exercises of this anniversary. These students, with their tutor as companion and guide, were destined in a large measure to lay the foundations of American education. I scarcely need say that the names of these students were Warren Colburn and James Gorham Carter, and that the name of their tutor was George Barrell Emerson. On leaving Cambridge, this triumvirate all went to teaching; Mr. Emerson, as the first master, became the founder of the English High School in Boston; Mr. Carter returned to teach at his home in Lancaster; and Mr. Colburn engaged in the same work in Boston. The following year appeared that little book which has justly been termed the greatest educational work of the century, — Colburn's First Lessons in Arithmetic.

It was in some sense the joint product of the three men just mentioned, but not in any sense which deprives Mr. Colburn of his proper claim to the authorship. It was taught in manuscript, and freely discussed by these pioneers in educational reform, and it is doubtless for this reason that, at the distance of nearly half a century, it is still unrivalled as the elementary work in a course of mathematical instruction. The paths of these three men diverged in subsequent years. Mr. Emerson gave himself to the work of teaching, showing both by theory and practice how perfect a school may be made, and, as a citizen, urging on successfully those larger measures of reform and legislation which the country so much needed. Mr. Colburn continued his labors as an author; and Mr. Carter did more perhaps than any other man at that period to stir the public mind to the importance of public schools; and afterwards, in the State legislation, originated and carried through some of our most important enactments on this subject.

There were three other men graduated at Harvard College about this time, who claim our notice at this point. These were the Rev. Charles Brooks, the Rev. Samuel Joseph May, and Walter Rogers Johnson. (Be careful to notice the Rogers of this name; it represents John Rogers, of saintly memory, who suffered at the stake in Smithfield, of whom Mr.

Johnson was a lineal descendant.) Mr. Brooks has been a life-long advocate of educational improvement, and manifests no disposition to put off the harness. Mr. May has labored with equal zeal, and was for a time at the head of one of our normal schools. Mr. Johnson early removed to Pennsylvania, and was largely instrumental in doing for that State what Mr. Carter and his coadjutors did for Massachusetts. In the labors of these men we find, I think, the main source of those influences which resulted in the establishment of the American Institute of Instruction.

The academic life of Harvard College had been greatly quickened at this period by the return from Europe of a young Christian scholar, four years of whose studious youth had been passed in the schools and universities of the Old World, and in deep reflection amid the scenes and upon the fields consecrated by the struggles and triumphs of our race. He had sat among the ruins of the Acropolis, had walked beneath the crumbling arches that span the Sacred Way, and had thought down hours to moments upon the plain of Marathon and in the pass of Thermopylæ; he had seen the rejoicings that followed the downfall of the first Napoleon; had been admitted to the society of the great literary celebrities of that period; had been welcomed to Abbotsford in the days of its glory, and won the



admiration of Lord Byron; he had sat at the feet of the first scholars of Germany, and indeed had drawn inspiration and instruction from all the old abodes of civilization. The influence of the poor Greek scholars, from the downfall of Constantinople, was hardly more marked upon the schools of Western Europe than that of Edward Everett, when he returned to lay upon the altar of his *alma mater* the precious mental wealth which he had been commissioned to gather, and to take his place in her corps of instruction.

With gifts and susceptibilities allotted to but the smallest portion of men, and at a period of life when these susceptibilities are most active, he had gazed upon all the pomp and pageantry that wait upon kings and courts, and, like Milton, had maintained his loyalty to the free principles in which he had been educated. "He had listened to the song of the sirens, but he had not been enchanted." With the liveliest appreciation of the beauties of Homer and Plato, and of the sterner teachings of Demosthenes and Aristotle, nor yet forgetful of that higher wisdom which comes from Moses and David, Isaiah and St. Paul, he had come to clothe the plain facts of American history with an eloquence which all antiquity had not surpassed; to show that the colonial history of America exhibits models of the same spirit and character which gave to Greece and Rome

their name and their praise among the nations ; to lay broad and deep the foundations of our higher periodical literature ; to show that what is termed the higher culture is perfectly consistent with the most ardent devotion to the popular welfare.

The fulness and exactness of learning which astonished the academic body at Cambridge was soon felt in every town and village in Massachusetts. The graduates of Harvard, who had hung upon the lips of this young Chrysostom, went to the bar, the pulpit, and the school-room with a refinement and a power which had not previously been known ; and the stories of the Mayflower, of Lexington and Concord, were soon heard from every school-boy in periods of classic beauty which the English language had not known before.\*

Such powers could not long be confined to the cloister ; they were demanded for the legislative hall, for the executive chamber, and for the highest diplomatic service which the nation had to perform. The Massachusetts Board of Education and her normal schools date from his administration ; and could his far-seeing counsels have prevailed, his native State would have still greater cause to bless and love him.

It was into this spirit that the young men whom I have mentioned were baptized ; and thus to the manly virtues that had grown up upon the farms of

\* See Appendix, Note A.

New England were united the culture and refinement which were drawn from distant climes and from the remotest generations.

There were important tributaries, however, to this main current of influence. In Connecticut, there were men at work who did much to expose the defects of the existing schools. William A. Alcott and Amos Bronson Alcott showed all the zeal of crusaders without their fanaticism. William Channing Woodbridge was preparing to do for geography what Warren Colburn had done for arithmetic. Denison Olmsted, in his master's oration at Yale College as early as 1816, had urged the establishment of a schoolmaster's academy, at the expense of the State. Josiah Holbrook had established an agricultural school at Derby, which, however, he soon left, to establish throughout the country the American Lyceum, and kindle popular enthusiasm by his admirable illustrations and instructions in elementary science. Meanwhile there appeared upon the stage a gentleman with the best culture of Scotland, and the pupil of her best teachers. This was William Russell, whose whole life has been given so successfully to the work in which he engaged in his youth. Thomas B. Wait, with no honors from the learned schools, but with the training of the printing-office, comes from Portland and forms the plan of acting upon the public mind

in behalf of education by means of the press. The enterprising Yankee printer finds his counterpart in the young scholar from Scotland. Mr. Russell edits, and Mr. Wait prints, the American Journal of Education; and in this journal the best views of European and American educators find expression. After several years of efficient editorial labor, Mr. Russell is called to different work, and his place is filled by Mr. Woodbridge, whom I have already mentioned, and who had just returned from the home of Fellenberg with a double portion of his spirit. The City of Boston, in the meantime, enlarged her system of schools to its present dimensions; in 1818, she established, not without difficulty, her primary schools; in 1821, her English High School went into operation, under the mastership of Mr. Emerson; in 1825, the Girls' High School was established (not the present Girls' High and Normal School, which is of much later growth); and these institutions, in connection with her Latin School, which had come down from the earliest history of the city, together with her grammar schools, constitute her present system of public instruction. To this great centre of American liberal culture all the active forces now began to tend. Mr. Woodbridge, as we have already seen, came from Connecticut with his enlarged views and earnest Christian spirit; he brought with him the two

Alcotts; and Mr. Holbrook soon found this city the most convenient field of labor. He here found Timothy Claxton engaged in a work so like his own, that they united their efforts; and we may still find, in our older school-rooms, air-pumps, or electrical machines, bearing the name of Claxton. Claxton had come from England; his early years were passed not at Eton, or Harrow, but at Earsham Hall, in the menial service of the friend of Burke, "the ingenious, the chivalrous, the high-souled Windham." He established a mechanical institution in London, the first of its kind, it is believed, in the world's metropolis; and found his way to Boston through St. Petersburg, — where he had built important gas-works, — here to originate the Mechanics' Institute, and perhaps, by its success, to suggest to the mind of John Lowell the endowment of the Lowell Institute, — the noblest charity of its kind which the country can boast.

But the whole country was stirred with these movements and discussions of which Boston may be considered as the centre. Every village and hamlet had its lyceum, every school-room felt their influence, every teacher shared in the new inspiration. And then, as always, when men's minds are deeply moved, they claim the aid of sympathy and tend to act in concert. Conventions were called, and temporary measures and expedients devised; districts and

towns, counties and states, began to move in harmony. As early as 1826, a temporary association was formed, in which some of the best minds of Boston were engaged, and among them George Ticknor. All these attempts prepared the way for a more brilliant final success. In March, 1815, a convention was held, in obedience to a call from the state committee of lyceums, to receive reports on the progress of lyceums and the condition of common schools, and to acquire information as to the organization of infant schools, and the use of school and cheap scientific apparatus. As was fitting, this meeting was called to order by Josiah Holbrook, and organized by the choice of the Rev. Jonathan Going, D.D., of Worcester, as chairman, and the Rev. E. K. Newton, of Marlborough, and J. Wilder, of Watertown, as clerks. During the sessions of this convention, which appear to have been eminently earnest and practical, it was voted to be expedient to form a permanent association of persons engaged and interested in the work of instruction; and Ebenezer Bailey, Benjamin D. Emerson, Abraham Andrews, George B. Emerson, and Gideon F. Thayer, of Boston, Henry Kemble Oliver, of Salem, and J. Wilder, of Watertown, were appointed a committee to digest a plan and prepare a constitution for the proposed association, with instructions to call a meeting for organization when they should deem it expedient.\*

\* See Appendix, Note B.



After mentioning the names of this committee, it is not necessary to dwell upon the details of their labors, or to say that they were performed with that wisdom and ability which were characteristic of the men. In obedience to their call another convention was called to meet on the 19th of the following August at the hall of the House of Representatives in Boston. This convention in August resulted in the complete organization of the American Institute of Instruction, which for thirty-seven years has annually summoned the teachers of the nation and the friends of education to sit in conference and counsel upon the dearest interests of humanity.

The convention of 1830, by which the Institute was organized, was no ordinary assembly; and whether judged by its intrinsic excellence, or by the results which have flowed from it, must be regarded as one of the marked points in the intellectual history of the country. It was truly a *national* convention. In it there sat the representatives of fifteen different states; and when we remember how imperfect were the means of travel at that period as compared with the present, we learn how deep a hold the objects of the meeting had taken of the American mind. It was truly catholic in its character. No sect nor party had any share in its deliberations; no cliques nor lobbies were busy with their selfish side-issues. The convention of 1776, which gave to the world the

Declaration of Independence, comprised no more of talent or patriotism nor was their work of much greater importance to the nation. But for the convention of 1830, that of 1776 might now have been a failure to warn, rather than a beacon to guide, the coming generations. The work of the former was supplemental of the latter. There was, I grant, more of the heroic element in the assemblage of farmers, who gave to the world the great charter of freedom, and so modestly pledged their lives, their fortunes, and their sacred honor, for its support. But there was also something of the moral sublime in the manly earnestness and comprehensive patriotism, with which five hundred men assembled, and, without hope of emolument or reward, undertook the work of educating the youth of America.

It was no vainglorious boasting which broke from the lips of Francis Wayland, our American Arnold, in the first sentences of his introductory discourse: (would that you all could know the manly energy and deep sincerity with which they were uttered!) "In the long train of her joyous anniversaries, New England has yet beheld no one more illustrious than this. We have assembled to-day not to proclaim how well our fathers have done, but to inquire how we may enable their sons to do better. We meet not for the purposes of empty pageant, nor yet of national rejoicing; but to deliberate upon the most

successful means of cultivating, to its highest perfection, that invaluable amount of intellect which Divine Providence has committed to our hands. We have come up here to the city of the Pilgrims to ask how we may render their children most worthy of their ancestors and most pleasing to their God. We meet to give to each other the right hand of fellowship in carrying forward this all-important work, and here to leave our professional pledge that if the succeeding generation do not act worthily, the guilt shall not rest upon those who are now the instructors of New England." Never was a pledge more faithfully redeemed. Gettysburg and a hundred other battle-fields and a regenerated nation testify to the fidelity of the instructors and the proficiency of the pupils.

The proceedings of that convention are worthy of our study. They show most conclusively that the men who composed it well knew what they were about. They show that they had surveyed the whole field of education and were competent to its improvement. They show that these men had already done much towards establishing a truly liberal culture in the schools of America. There was John Collins Warner, already a veteran, and probably the head of the medical profession in America, to lecture upon physical education. There was Warren Colburn, to lecture on arithmetic, who had already reformed this science, and through this had

affected powerfully other branches of instruction. There was William Channing Woodbridge, to lecture not upon his favorite subject, geography, but upon vocal music, at that time scarcely known in our public schools; and it was through the influence of Mr. Woodbridge that Lowell Mason introduced into musical instruction the method of Pestalozzi. There was John Pierpont, to teach by precept and example the principles of elocution. There was Cornelius Conway Felton, to teach the utility of classical instruction as a means of education. There was William Russell, to plead the cause of infant schools. There was Francis J. Grund, from the best schools of Germany, to lecture upon the higher mathematics. There was James Gorham Carter, to urge the claims of geography. There was Ebenezer Bailey, to teach English grammar; and Samuel P. Newman, to teach Rhetoric; and William J. Adams, to urge the importance of better school architecture. Linear drawing was discussed by Walter Rogers Johnson; the symmetrical development of the mental faculties, by George Barrell Emerson; the best methods of teaching Spelling, by Gideon French Thayer; lyceums were discussed by Nehemiah Cleaveland; school discipline, by Samuel Reed Hall, I believe the earliest American author on this subject; and monitorial instruction, by Henry Kemble Oliver. Thus thoroughly and exhaustively did these men lay the foundations of the theory and practice of teaching for the schools of America; thus

patiently and joyously, through five sultry August days, with no festivals or excursions, *did they apply themselves to the labor that they loved.* And thus, in full bloom and maturity, like Minerva from the head of her sire, came into existence the American Institute of Instruction! \* I would gladly dwell longer upon this part of my subject; I would, were it in my power, bring fresh to your minds the personal bearing as well as the mental qualities of these men whom we this day delight to honor; I would paint the commanding presence of John Pierpont, both poet and reformer, who could command at will the sweetness and tenderness of Anacreon, or the withering fire of Juvenal; whose Christian lyrics are breathed from devout lips upon every Sabbath morning's air; and whose trenchant blows in controversy fell like bolts from the red right hand of Jupiter. It was his fortune to give name to our association. I would mention the scholarly and gentlemanlike bearing of Cornelius C. Felton, whose genial wit and varied learning made him the pride and delight of every social circle and every college hall; who treasured up the wisdom of the past, that he might give greater strength and completeness to the present; who spent a life, too short, alas! in grateful service of his *alma mater*, but was never happier than when, leaving the cloister, he gave aid and encourage-

\* See Appendix, Note C.

ment to the public school. I would notice the elastic form, the sparkling eye, and courteous manners, of Gideon F. Thayer, who followed with paternal affection the fortunes of the Institute, in whose organization he bore an honorable part, and who has left his mark upon the education of this city.

But it is more especially my duty to trace with some particularity the character of him whom these pioneers thought worthy to place at their head, as they entered this new field of patriotic and Christian effort ; who presided over its deliberations for the first three years of its existence ; whose fortune it was, at the expiration of a quarter of a century, again to pronounce its introductory discourse, review its achievements, and give it a hearty " God speed you ! " as it entered upon a new period of its existence. It was the good fortune of the American Institute of Instruction to intrust its welfare to the hands of Francis Wayland, when he was comparatively unknown to fame *as a teacher*. And now that his work is done, and he has left so enviable a reputation behind him, we may claim as our inheritance a portion of that fame which has filled the land. It is indeed true, that Dr. Wayland was well known as a clergyman ; his discourse upon the moral dignity of the missionary enterprise, placed him at once in the front-rank of American writers



and thinkers, and showed that a man had arisen who was to become one of the leaders of his generation.

His whole character was one of wide range and varied powers. The central and controlling element, however, was his power as a teacher. It is from this stand-point that his whole course and character must be interpreted. In saying this, I am not forgetful of the eminence which he attained as a divine and as an author, and, I may also add, as a philanthropist. I do not forget that his first inclination on leaving college was to the medical profession; nor do I forget the high distinction which he attained during the brief period of his ministry in Boston. But a little reflection will show us that his success as a clergyman and as an author, may be resolved into his character as a teacher. The discourses which won for him so wide a fame at the very beginning of his ministry, are all directed, not primarily to our emotional natures, but rather to the enlightenment of the understanding. The heart is moved, but it is because the intellect is first convinced, and it must yield obedience. So also in his more elaborate publications, his constant aim was to teach men more clearly the laws of their moral and intellectual natures, and thus make them feel the reasonableness and necessity of obeying them. His mission to the world was that of a teacher. To this end was he born, and for this

purpose was he sent into the world, that he might teach and illustrate the truth. Hence it was that he found no rest until he gained his position as a teacher. The medical profession did not satisfy him; and the clerical office, though he always gloried in the exercise of its sacred functions, did not satisfy him until he had united to its ordinary duties the kindred work of instruction.

His first summons to make teaching his life-work was from the college in which he had been educated, and where he had already as a tutor given evidence of the ability which won for him a professorship. He had scarcely entered upon his work at Union College before he was invited to the presidency of Brown University; so deep was the impression which his ministry in Boston had made upon the leading minds of the Baptist denomination, of his peculiar fitness for the position which was to give character to its ministry and affect in no small degree the academic life of the nation. It was evident, from the very beginning of his work at Providence, that he was no stranger to its duties. It was seen at once that he was competent, not merely to discharge the executive duties and join in the ordinary routine of college work, but that such was the vigor and grasp of his mind, that both as president and professor he could give new life to the government of the college and new power to

the professorship. It was not long after going to Providence that he was invited to deliver the introductory address before this body, which I have already noticed. This discourse, whether we regard its intrinsic excellence or its effects upon the public mind, was quite worthy the man who seven years before had roused all Christendom to the work of missions. The subject of education has been discussed for forty years, and by many of the first minds of the country; but there yet remains to be written a more philosophical or more forcible statement of its principles than that which introduced to the favor of the public the American Institute of Instruction. The Institute, as it passes down to coming generations will accumulate new powers and grasp more fully the work to which it is devoted; but the time will never come when its members will have occasion to blush in examining the strength and finish of their foundation as laid by him whose character we are considering.

But we are called upon to consider this discourse not so much as related to the body before which it was delivered, as with reference to the development of its author's own powers. A man might have written the discourse of which I am speaking, and yet been but an ordinary teacher. A true philosopher in theory may be but an indifferent hand to put his theory into practice. But the promise which

Dr. Wayland gave on the platform was more than redeemed when he passed to the recitation-room. It was here that his great powers appeared to the best advantage, and shone with their most brilliant lustre. It is Dr. Wayland in the recitation-room with whom we as teachers are most interested; and it is his character in this sphere that I would fain reproduce for imitation and love. His method with his classes is best given in his own words.

“1. In the recitation-room let neither instructor nor pupil ever make use of the book.

“2. Let the portion previously assigned for the exercise be so mastered by the pupil, both in plan and illustration, that he will be able to recite it in order, and explain the connection of the different parts with each other without the necessity of assistance from his instructor. To give the language of the author is not, of course, desirable; it is sufficient if the idea is given. The questions of the instructor should have respect to principles that may be deduced from the text, practical application of the doctrines, objections which may be raised, etc.

“3. Let the lesson which was recited on one day be invariably reviewed on the day succeeding.

“4. As soon as any considerable progress has been made in the work, let a review from the beginning be commenced. This should comprehend, for one exercise, as much as had been previously recited

in two or three days, and should be confined to a brief analysis of the argument, with the mere mention of the illustrations.

"5. As soon as the whole portion thus far recited has been reviewed, let a new review be commenced, and continued in the same manner, and thus on successively, until the work is completed."

This was his routine; the harness, so to speak, in which he was accustomed to train his classes in the principles of metaphysics and morals. This routine he observed with strictness, but he was never the slave of it. The "advance," the "back review," and the "immediate review," were always attended to with care and precision; and when his class had completed the text-book in this manner, they were ready for a thorough examination upon its contents; not merely by answering questions upon the text proposed by the teacher, but by presenting the entire argument of their author, and clothing this argument in their own language. He asked no questions until the pupil had done his work, and shown his mastery of the course of thought, and given in proper order the statement of every important fact and principle. He then called upon him to illustrate every important principle by examples drawn from the pupil's own observation, or presented cases which were to be explained by what had been learned from the text-book.

The stranger, in visiting Dr. Wayland's classroom, was somewhat surprised to see a recitation begin with nothing more than a quiet nod from the Doctor; and then hear the pupil, in answer to this silent call, rise and give promptly the entire plan of the hour's work. As the recitation proceeded, he was still more surprised to find that the teacher, no less than the scholar, was liable to examination; to hear the members of the class propose questions, state difficulties, and urge objections, with the same freedom which they would use in their intercourse with each other. He would be both surprised and delighted to observe, that there was a far higher work in progress than merely reciting what had been learned in the study. He would see both teacher and pupils engage in earnest discussion; and while the intellectual and moral distance between them was so great, he could hardly understand how their official intercourse could be so free, so friendly, and so kind. He would see, at all times, a careful attention, which showed that the student was considering his subject as well as his lesson — the matter as well as its form; he would see this attention increase to a high animation, and not seldom arise to an intense excitement. In all this there would be no disorder, no unkindness, no diversion from the subject legitimately before the class. He would sometimes see a half-dozen stu-



dents spring to their feet at once to confront the Doctor's views, and urge what they considered unanswerable arguments against his positions. Yet not more serenely did Jupiter preside in the councils of Olympus, than the Doctor swayed, soothed, roused, and calmed, at his pleasure, these young minds that were opening and strengthening under his inspiration and his care.

Freedom of discussion and freedom of opinion were among the most prominent features of his tuition. He scorned to force any view or opinion of his own upon his pupils, except so far as he could sustain it by correct logic. To take any advantage of his mere position to influence the minds intrusted to his care, he esteemed not only mean, but wicked. It may be thought that this freedom of discussion would degenerate into license, and result rather in laxity and dissipation than in the true discipline and healthful excitement of the mind. But this could never happen with Dr. Wayland. He well understood when discussion had reached its proper limit, and a word or a look even was sufficient to check any further debate, and bring back the class to the regular work of the hour. The stimulus thus given to the minds of his pupils, both to investigate and to think, was remarkable. Many a time would his class leave the recitation-room restive, and perhaps smarting good-naturedly under

a sense of defeat, resolved that the next day the doctor should be annihilated. And then would come the marshalling of authorities and the parade of undergraduate logic and wisdom; to all of which the Doctor would listen with perfect kindness and patience, and oftentimes with a smile, which foretokened what was coming; and when it was all in, he would quietly reply, "Well, my son; what then?" All at once, the thought would flash across the students' minds that all their labor had been misapplied,—that their points were really irrelevant to the question at issue; and that, so far from annihilating the doctor, they had not even hit him. Many and many a time would a plausible array of facts and reasoning be disposed of by his well-known interrogative reply, "What then?"

Those subjects that most seriously agitated the public mind were always welcome to his recitation. At the time when the questions of slavery and protection were so prominent, and were made the tests of political orthodoxy or heterodoxy, he never adopted the cowardly, or, as it was often termed, the "*prudent and cautious*" course, in dealing with them. Instead of dodging the question of slavery in the recitation-room, he would give several extra hours to its discussion.

But the happiest results of this free intercourse between teacher and pupil were seen when, as would

often happen, the Doctor, waking under the inspiration of the subject and the enthusiasm of his pupils, would take the offensive, and pour forth from the resources of his own mind such floods of light and such force of argument, or present such incentives to effort, as would command the admiration and stir to their very depths the minds of his pupils. On such occasions the spontaneous flow of his thoughts and feelings would clothe itself in the simplest and most expressive forms of language; his utterance, instead of becoming vociferous, would sink almost to a whisper, but assume an emphasis that would transform his pupils to statues, and diffuse through the classroom the stillness of the tomb. It was a perfect realization of Carlyle's idea — spirit holding mysterious contact with spirit, thought kindling itself at the fire of living thought. These spells of his eloquence were thrown over his classes most frequently in connection with those great historical names which naturally come up as illustrations of great qualities of character, or those events in history in which moral conflict has been most strikingly displayed; or they were seen in connection with some of those weaknesses of student life which tax alike the patience and the ability of the Faculty.

It will be seen at once how much the tuition described above, in which both teacher and pupils unite in eager search for truth, in which the inexpe-

rience of youth takes counsel of the maturest wisdom, in which the ripest manhood gives tone and strength to the hopes and aspirations of boyhood, in which an intellect of the first order, and widest range, and keenest vision, guides along the highways and byways of knowledge the erring footsteps of the young ; in which a heart that could embrace with its sympathies the wants of a world, and yet was never happier than when unbending in sport and frolic with a child ; a heart whose stores of passion, trained in obedience to the severest laws of virtue, would now open in admiring sympathy to all the trials and triumphs of a Socrates, a Paul, a Howard, or a Wilberforce, and now pour forth the storms of its scorn and contempt upon a Nero, a Borgia, a George IV., or a Robespierre ; would rule by its own moral momentum the ripening faculties of those just stepping to their manhood ; in short, in which a man worthy to govern an empire, and whose counsels were sought by church and state, at council-boards and in senate-chambers, would guide and warn, inform and inspire, the youth just arming for life's warfare ;

" Would try each art, reprove each dull delay,  
Allure to brifter worlds, and lead the way ;"

it will, I say, at once be understood how far a tuition scene like this surpasses the dull proprieties, the unmeaning formalities, and the tame instructions, that too often characterize the college recitation-room.

But no verbal description can do justice to the reality. It is important, however, to specify more distinctly some of the elements of the remarkable power which he wielded over his classes.

Among the most prominent of these was his modesty, — the entire absence of all mere assumption and pretence. The student who had seen Dr. Wayland only in the general intercourse of college life during the first three years of his course had come to regard him, I think, rather with a feeling of reverential awe than of confiding affection. He had felt his moral power, it is true, in the chapel, and he had unconsciously been moulded by his influence, which so completely pervaded the entire academic community. He had come to feel that he was both good and great; and as he approached his senior year he felt that he was about to come in contact with one of the first of American minds, and perhaps the first of American teachers. But he found the real Dr. Wayland to be far different from the ideal that had long floated in his fancy. The commanding presence from which he had almost shrunk in ordinary official routine at once assumed a more benign aspect when he came under his personal instruction. He had supposed that in some mysterious manner, and at a dignified distance, the Doctor would dispense greatness and goodness upon him, while he was to drink in his influence by some kind of spiritual

absorption. But how agreeable was his surprise when he came to realize the real simplicity of that character which his imagination had clothed in so different a garb ; and how keen was his delight when he came to feel that this great teacher was so ready to take him by the hand and lead him with a father's tenderness through the mazes of metaphysics and morals, and sought rather to encourage him to use his own powers than to astonish by displays of talent and learning ! It is not unlikely that there was sometimes a feeling of disappointment in the first approach to the President's instruction ; that, in the absence of all pomp and display, as in the great Teacher of Israel, they were "offended."

But this feeling of disappointment, if it ever existed, soon gave place to one of the highest admiration, when he came to understand how simple and how *real* was the greatness which had seemed so awful in the distance ; and how great was the pleasure when he found himself, he scarcely knew how, coming within the sphere of the Doctor's sympathies, and advancing, under his guidance, into new fields of inquiry, by an influence that seemed to pervade rather than control him, that set his whole mental machinery into an activity unknown before, and taught him how great was the difference between education and mere instruction.

He was startled, perhaps, in reply to some of the



first questions he put to the Doctor, to receive the pleasant reply, "I don't know, my son; I am not able to answer your question;" and he would then very likely proceed in the mildest way to let the pupil know that his real difficulty lay in his form of statement rather than in his lack of knowledge. He would give all the information sought in so clear and simple a manner as to make the student feel that it was a part of his own previous knowledge.

Another quality that demands notice was his cheerfulness. Dr. Wayland was a firm believer in what I might almost term the divine efficacy of laughter. It has been a matter of surprise to many who knew him but slightly, to learn that he was so fond of unbending himself in cheerful wit and humor. His powers of ridicule and satire were surpassed only by his powers of reasoning and analysis. But these powers, though sometimes used with great effect in his classes, were never carried to the point of unkindness. The shouts of laughter that were often heard from the senior recitation-room, with the voice of the president leading the merry chorus, are among the well-remembered events of Dr. Wayland's administration; and served to show, that in that room there sat a teacher who was not afraid to use all the energies of the human mind. Like the accomplished organist, he used every stop and pedal, and swept the whole key-board of the

human soul with a master's freedom and a master's power. Men of smaller mental calibre would have deemed such indulgence beneath their personal and professional dignity; and such men would have judged rightly for themselves; but Dr. Wayland was philosopher enough to know that the human mind has some other faculties besides conscience and memory, and that perfect mental health required a high degree of cheerfulness.

Another marked feature of his character was his energy. This high quality was seen not in hurry or hurly-burly, but in a persistent earnestness of manner in every phase of his duties. You are not to think of him as moving with that stately moderation which many consider so essential to station and dignity, but rather with a firmness and elasticity which bespoke a mind intent upon high purposes. One needed only to see him leave his room, at the summons of the college bell, and mingle in the throng of the students, mounting the stairs frequently two or three steps at a time, to feel that there was, in his very bearing, an educating influence of no ordinary kind; to feel that idlers and drones would find no paradise in an institution under his control. Indolence in students was one of those deadly sins which most severely taxed the resources of his charity.

Closely allied to this energy of character was his

untiring industry, or, I should rather say, his intense love of work ; for it seemed to take rather the form of a passion for labor, rather than of that dogged assiduity, which is too often dignified by the name of industry. He held all his time and talents as properly at the disposal of the college. Hence it was with great difficulty that he could be induced, even for a day, to leave his college work for the more general services to the public, to which he was so often called. "Come to me at any time of night or day, when I can serve you, young gentlemen," he would say to the students ; "it is my business to work for you ; I am paid for it ; and you may claim my services not as a favor, but as your lawful right." And this was not mere talk ; for he was never better pleased than when taken at his word.

But it is time to follow Dr. Wayland from the recitation-room to the chapel. Here his influence was felt by the whole college. Here, in addition to the positive instructions that he gave, was exercised that unconscious tuition which forms so important a part of the work of the true teacher. The chapel, be it remembered, was not the gorgeous structure in which the students of King's College pay their devotions.

"The high embowed roof,  
With antic pillars, massy-proof,  
And storied windows richly dight,  
Casting a dim religious light,"

were all wanting. The old chapel of Brown University was not reared by royal affluence, but by pious poverty. I will not say how many feet short nor how many feet narrow (for length and breadth seem quite extravagant terms to apply to that humble apartment), the room was to which we were summoned for morning and evening prayers. Its plainness would have satisfied the utmost demands of George Fox. But this little chapel had its virtues. It brought all its inmates within the sphere of each other's sympathies; it brought teachers and students face to face. There was no need of monitors; absentees and truants could not hope to escape detection.

The services of a college chapel are not usually either impressive or improving. They are considered rather as disciplinary, as furnishing a convenient opportunity for roll-call, rather than as religious and devotional exercises. But the deep reverence and religious fervor of Dr. Wayland's nature gave to these services a far higher character. He stood upon an open platform within a few feet of the students, so that the slightest expression of his countenance and the most delicate modulations of his voice, and, indeed, the whole effect of his superior presence, had full play upon his youthful auditory. He was no elocutionist, in the strict sense of the term; his voice, though of great compass and power, had

never been trained by the professed elocutionist. In all matters of gesture and vocal expression, he was a law unto himself. As he was not the slave of art, he frequently rose to excellences to which art can never attain. His manner, though not elegant, was very impressive. His reading of the Scriptures seldom failed to command attention, for he showed by his voice and manner how completely their sentiments had taken possession of his own soul. No one, I think, who sat in that chapel for four years, or even for four weeks, can fail to remember his reading such passages as the ninetyeth psalm, the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, the speech of Paul to the Athenians, or some of his favorite selections from the book of Job. Upon such passages he expended all the resources of his emotional nature, and rendered them with a strength and delicacy of feeling which seemed to impart to them a new meaning, and clothe them with a fresh inspiration. All must remember how he would sometimes, when reading, raise his clear keen eye from the sacred page and give in a single sentence the substance of a sermon, and send home to the conscience a living truth by a well-chosen illustration; and so the truths divine would come mended from his tongue. The chapel services thus became an important means of moral and religious growth, and even the more thoughtless students were often moulded under their influence to a better life.

But the chapel was the scene of another class of influences than the religious and devotional. It was here that he conferred with the students upon such points of order and discipline as naturally arise in college life. All who are acquainted with college life well know what slight causes will sometimes move the whole body of students as the heart of one man; and with what earnestness they will rush to the wildest extremes. It is a common impression, that Dr. Wayland met all cases of this nature with the mere force of despotic power; and, it is true, there were cases in which he was not careful to answer for the course which he thought best to pursue. In cases of manifest perversity of character and deliberate opposition to rightful authority there was little disposition to temporize; but when, as often happens, students really felt themselves aggrieved by any college requirement, or came into collision with any individuals or regulations in the community at large, his resort was invariably to persuasion and argument. Whenever the moral tone of the college appeared low, it was often quickened and elevated by one of his peculiar and irresistible appeals from the chapel platform after evening prayers. The college never felt his power more than on some of these occasions. They have been so well described by one of his pupils, that I cannot but appropriate his language. "It



was not instruction ; it was not argument ; it was not exhortation. It was a mixture of wit and humor, of ridicule, sarcasm, pathos, and fun, of passionate remonstrance, earnest appeal, and solemn warning ; poured forth, not at random, but with a knowledge of the laws of emotion, to which Lord Kames himself could have added nothing. The effect was indescribable. No Athenian audience ever hung more tumultuously on the lips of the divine Demosthenes. That little chapel heaved and swelled with the intensity of its pent-up forces. The billows of passion rose and fell like the waves of a tempestuous sea. At one moment all were burning with indignation ; the next, they were melted to tears. Now every one was convulsed with laughter ; and now, as solemn as if the revelations of doom were just opening upon him. Emotions the most diverse followed one another in quick succession. Admiration, resentment, awe, and worship in turn swelled every bosom. At length the storm spent itself. The sky cleared, and the sun shone out with increased brightness. The ground had been softened and fertilized, and the whole air purified." I have listened with wonder and admiration to the stately eloquence of Daniel Webster ; I have been raised to ecstasy by the graceful energy and matchless beauties of Edward Everett ; but never have I felt the nails driven by these mas-

ters of assemblies so penetrate the soul as when I have listened to the words of Francis Wayland. The gifted and wayward Athenian, who was taught by Socrates, has forcibly described the influence of his master's teaching as compared with the great orators of his time. His words are quite pertinent to my subject. "Whenever," says Alcibiades, in the Banquet, "I heard Pericles, or any other great orator, I was entertained and delighted; I felt that he had spoken well; but no mortal speech has ever excited in my mind such emotions as are kindled by this magician. When I hear him, I am, as it were, charmed and fettered; my heart leaps like an inspired Corybant; my inmost soul is stung by his words as by the bite of a serpent; it is indignant at its own rude and ignoble character. I often weep tears of regret, and think how base and inglorious is the life I lead. Nor am I the only one who weeps like a child, and despairs of himself; many others are affected in the same way." Socrates and Wayland belong to the same school of oratory.

During the greater part of Dr. Wayland's administration of the college, he spent his Sabbath evenings with the more thoughtful portion of his pupils in the chapel in the form of a bible-class. This was a voluntary exercise, and was even more free and familiar than the ordinary recitations. This exercise was eminently biblical and Christian. For

theology, in the scholastic sense of the term, he had little inclination ; and for the questions that divide the Christian sects still less. He could not be drawn into strictly sectarian discussion ; but on Christian themes, upon the great questions which arise between the human soul and its Maker, apart from their metaphysical subtleties, upon the characters and events recorded in the sacred Scriptures, — upon these and all their kindred subjects he bestowed the best energies of his mind and the warmest affections of his heart. He never seemed more at ease, his powers never appeared to act in greater harmony than during those blessed hours when the outward world seemed to have vanished, and both teacher and pupils were upborne, by the themes which they were considering, to the society of the world from which they originated. He was sometimes charged with a want of theological soundness ; though his teachings generally harmonized with a very moderate Calvinism. To charges of this nature he never paid any attention ; being more solicitous to realize his own ideal of doctrine and practice than to stand high in the schools. On one occasion he had preached a sermon of great power, which seemed utterly to ignore what is called “the doctrine of the perseverance of the saint.” It was called forth by those shortcomings in the Christian life which are too often seen in young men in

college, who are forgetful of their high calling, several instances of which at that time had caused the president great pain. Some of the undergraduate theologians took the alarm, and felt that the Doctor's theology must be looked after. At the meeting of the bible-class on the following Sabbath evening accordingly, one of them very respectfully asked him if he believed in the perseverance of the saints. He looked at his pupil for a moment with a smile of great benignity, not unmingled with roguery, and replied, "My son, I believe in *saints persevering*." The answer, on the whole, was deemed satisfactory; and the Doctor's heresies were not prosecuted further. In truth, it was not thought safe.

In the selections of Scripture for study, he usually gave his pupils the opportunity of choice. There were, however, some parts of the Bible the exegesis of which he would never undertake. At the beginning of the academic year, at one time when the class was first called together, he requested the class to make the usual selection. An aspiring freshman proposed the Book of Revelations. The Doctor replied, "I do not understand it, my son. I am not competent to teach it." He could never be persuaded to waste any time upon the "beasts" and "heads" and "horns" and "vials," the "mystic numbers," and "prophetic days," which have been

such fruitful themes for useless volumes, and made men more desirous to solve millennial problems than to perform present duties. When attempts were made to turn him aside to the discussion of these speculative topics, he would remind the young men how much richer fields of thought and investigation were open before them in the inspired word, and which were clearly within reach of their faculties. Sometimes he simply replied, "It is not for us to know the times and the seasons which the Father hath put in his own power."

In these exercises he laid the foundation of many a fair Christian character and many a skilful interpreter of the Scriptures, not so much by close attention to Greek syntax, though this was not slighted, as by an observance of those higher principles and laws which govern the intellectual and moral nature of man. How grandly would he paint or reproduce a Scripture character! How real and life-like would a Scripture scene become under a few touches from his hand! With systems and dogmas he did not intermeddle. Like the Great Teacher, he threw out the vital principles and motives, and left them to crystallize according to the laws of the human mind and under the guidance of that spirit,

"That doth prefer,  
Before all temples, the upright heart and pure."

It will be inferred, from what has been said, that Dr. Wayland would not rest satisfied with merely the intellectual and moral advancement of his pupils. The great truths of religion exercised a complete lordship over all his powers. It was from the religious stand-point that he aimed, and that he loved to view his work. His dislike of certain forms of cant made him seem "cold" indeed to some whose ideas of religion were low and vague; by his opposition to certain measures which are still regarded by some as what are termed "effectual means of grace," he incurred the censures of men who had need to learn the first principles of the Christian life. He never would consent that attempts should be made to advance religion at the expense of morality; the unrighteous means could, in his estimation, never gain the righteous end; the first and great commandment could not be obeyed by violating all the rest. Hence he insisted that it was as much a duty to study as to pray; that attendance upon a religious meeting was no virtue, if it involved the neglect of another urgent obligation. Young men who came to college because they were called to prepare for the ministry, were sometimes informed that "God never called men to do but one thing at a time;" and that if he had called them to prepare for the ministry, he had not called them to college to be poor scholars, and set bad examples



to their fellows. Religious zeal which kindled into seraphic ardor for the conversion of young ladies, but which always fainted at the blackboard; eloquence, however renowned at the conference meeting, but which could never recall an idea of Butler, or Whately, in the recitation-room, were never appreciated by Dr. Wayland.

In 1842, the City of Providence was visited by one of the most celebrated evangelists, as they are termed, which the country possessed. It was one of his first visits to New England, and very high expectations were cherished respecting the results of his labors. Dr. Wayland had formed a favorable opinion of the man, and was disposed to aid him all in his power. He did not, however, feel that his claims were to override every other obligation. He afforded every possible opportunity to the students to attend his meetings; but the regular course of college duty was not suspended. This was not sufficient in the estimation of the friends of this great reformer. The word was given that the college must stop; that the revivalist must occupy the college chapel, and that some religious life must be infused into Brown University. Changes were rung upon Ezekiel's vision; and the President and Faculty of the college were among the dry bones to be re-animated and clothed with flesh. The president soon saw to what extremes the excitement was run-

ning, and gave orders for all the students to keep their regular hours of study in the evening, and forbade any more indulgence in attendance upon the evening meetings. He found that those who got permission to attend meeting, often went to the theatre, and that, under the guise of religion, vice was making headway in the college. This decisive action attracted great attention from the excited zealots in the city; and the storm raged with a fury that would have quite paralyzed the nerves of even valiant men. Some of the more zealous students joined in the onslaught upon the president, and a plan was devised, and was about to be carried into execution, of exposing in a prominent religious journal, the indifference of the Doctor to the religious welfare of the college. The more considerate students stood aloof from this rash measure. As a junior member of the Faculty, I was requested by one of the students to inform the Doctor what was in contemplation. I met him in the college yard and briefly informed him of what had been told me. "Come to my room," was his only reply. On reaching his room, "Tell me," he said, "all you know about this matter." I did so, and answered his questions as far as I was able. He walked his room in silence for some time, and then said, in measured words, and half in soliloquy, "I feel ashamed and humbled before God that I have no

more piety ;" but, stopping and fixing his piercing gaze on me, he added, — " If this be the spirit of piety which you have been describing, I want nothing to do with it." He spent an hour in going over the whole subject ; and it is one of the hours of my life which I would have the last to be forgotten. Such humility and such earnestness, such evident grief, that he should be suspected even of indifference to the supreme desire of his heart ; and then such decision and firmness : all this, contrasted with the fanaticism that was prevailing in the community, taught me the vast distance that separates real character from mere profession, semblance from substance, the true Christian, humble, tolerant, and brave, from the counterfeit that is noisy, ambitious, uncharitable, and selfish. The excitement passed away ; the revivalist went through his campaign, but did not preach in the college chapel ; and Dr. Wayland was not converted nor moved ; and ere many months had passed, those who had been loud in their condemnation of him, were seeking his counsel how best to repair the spiritual desolation which the evangelist had left behind him.

The character of the general discipline of the college under Dr. Wayland will be inferred from what has been already said. His methods have been sometimes censured as being deficient in the *suaviter in modo*, but they certainly were never

wanting in the *fortiter in re*. The great energy of his character found expression here as in the other phases of his life. It was his aim to make a first-class college for studious, orderly, and earnest young men; and in this he succeeded. It was no part of his plan to mingle the elements of the reform school with the college. Hence, young men who came under his care in the expectation of whiling away four years of life in a little study, much idleness, and genteel dissipation, suddenly found that they had made the worst possible selection in their choice of a college. Nor was the case much better with another class who considered themselves "geniuses." Their gifts, whether in philosophy or poetry, were frequently not rated as high by the President as by themselves, and this difference of opinion often resulted in separation. The young "divines" shared the same fate as the "philosophers," and graduated early. The "promising young men" who came with recommendations, which had taxed the resources of the language, were sometimes disgusted to find that good scholarship and good behavior were the indispensable conditions of happiness and success at Brown University. The well-known words of Thomas Arnold, addressed to his school at Rugby, "It is not necessary that this school consist of a hundred pupils, nor of fifty, but it is necessary that it consist of Christian young gentlemen," expresses

with admirable conciseness the policy adopted by Dr. Wayland. This policy was not favorable to great numbers, nor was it at numbers that he primarily aimed. He first sought for a good college, and, if that became a large one, he would, of course, be gratified. It is not strange that he sometimes seemed hard and unsympathizing to reckless and idle students. It could not be otherwise: they had little in common. Intent upon great objects, and with every energy of his soul pressing on to their attainment, how could he appear amiable to triflers and pleasure-seekers? "And they were offended in him," is recorded of him who spoke as never man spake, and taught as never man taught. "The disciple is not above his master, nor the servant greater than his lord."

But it must be recorded with what tender regard he watched the progress of the faithful and high-minded student. It is not common, I fancy, for college presidents to summon poor students to their rooms, and with a father's tenderness give to them from their own pockets, five, ten, fifteen, or fifty dollars, with words of affection that outweighed the money; but Dr. Wayland did this. If he sometimes seemed like an incarnate Sinai to the transgressor, "he never broke the bruised reed nor quenched the smoking flax." I have seen something of New England colleges, and taken some pains to

acquaint myself with their organization and administration; but I have yet to see or hear of one where there was more of order or happiness, more of study or scholarship, than in Brown University, under the direction of Dr. Wayland and his able associates.

I must not omit to mention as one element of Dr. Wayland's great influence, his personal presence. The powers of mind and qualities of heart, which gained him such distinction, were recommended by such advantages of person as are seldom seen. Never had great powers a fitter field of expression than in his varied and ample features. Never was a noble manhood clothed with more certain indications of manliness. The range of expression in his countenance was as vast as the demands of the indwelling soul might require. His frown was terrible as the thunders of Sinai; his smile was tender and benign; his laughter rich, genial, hearty, and thrilling; his compassion deep and melting; while his reverence awakened in all who saw it the same great quality. His features were trained to the habitual expression of the higher — perhaps some would say the sterner — emotions of the soul; and those who saw his countenance only in repose, or in the performance of his more public duties, could hardly understand how the finer feelings could dwell there; and still



less how all the innocent frolic and fun of less gifted natures could play and linger as sunshine among features that seemed framed to symbolize the ten commandments, or the Sermon on the Mount. Such, I well remember, was my own impression of the man before I had seen him; and well do I remember how and when the illusion was dispelled. I had just arrived in Providence, with all the hopes and fears — the fears being greatly in the ascendant — of a candidate for admission to college. In that buoyant state of mind I was wandering, while the shades of evening were falling, in one of the entries of the college. I turned to the sound of cheerful voices and approaching footsteps, and saw a man spring with a bound from the sidewalk to the door, with a merry laugh that woke the echoes of the whole building. I said to myself at once, "That is Dr. Wayland." I knew that manly form could belong to no one else, and I never had occasion to change the opinion.

With all these advantages of person, there was an entire absence of any consciousness of them on his own part. On the contrary, there was a neglect of manner; the inner man was so intent on high themes and aims, that the outward man was not thought of. There were times, however, when he rose to the full height of his manhood. He never failed to meet the demands of a great occasion. One

such I must mention. In 1843, John Tyler, at that time President of the United States, visited New England, to be present at the celebration of the completion of Bunker Hill monument. He had incurred the unpopularity of his party, but, in the estimation of the people of Rhode Island, he had sinned past all forgiveness, in the course which he had taken in their domestic troubles. He had failed, as they claimed, to throw over them the broad shield of the Constitution; they believed that he had disregarded one of the plainest constitutional provisions; and the Constitution, the violated Constitution, was on the lips of every loyal citizen of Rhode Island. Still he was President of the United States; the chief magistrate must be respected, whatever might be thought of the man. The people of Providence, proverbially hospitable, were resolved to sustain their reputation on this occasion. The heart of Dr. Wayland, then, as always, was with the people; but he must represent the college, and receive the President. The President and suite were conducted to Rhode Island Hall, where the reception was to take place. The Doctor appeared in full academic costume, with the Oxford cap and gown, at the head of the faculty and corporation, and, after the introduction of the President, thus addressed him:—

“It gives me peculiar pleasure, in the name of the corporation, faculty, and undergraduates of Brown

University, to welcome to this ancient seat of learning, the chief magistrate of the United States. It has not escaped the observation of your fellow-citizens that, while discharging the duties of a laborious profession, and loaded with all the honors which your country has it in her power to bestow, you have yet found leisure to cultivate the liberal sciences, and, with parental care, to watch over the colleges and university of your native State.

“Human life presents no more august spectacle than that of a mind enriched with all the learning of the past, directing, by their own choice, the present energies of a mighty people, and yet, with patriotic foresight, guiding the destinies of the future into the channels of intelligence and virtue.

“*We bid you welcome to this university, consecrated to the cause of sound learning, pure religion, republican liberty, and* CONSTITUTIONAL LAW.

“We shall be gratified with the opportunity of exhibiting to you the means by which private munificence has enabled us to accomplish the object of our foundation, and to receive the benefit of your large experience and mature wisdom. Allow me first to present to you the corporation, faculty, and undergraduates of Brown University.”

The cursory reading of this little speech shows nothing more than the ordinary courtesies and proprieties incident to such occasions. But in the act-

ual delivery there was a scene which may not occur once in a lifetime. The opening sentences were uttered with a dignity and self-possession that Daniel Webster might have envied ; but when he reached the sentence concluding with *constitutional law*, he rose with a majesty and emphasis peculiarly his own, until, in the utterance of the last two words, he seemed the very impersonation of avenging justice. It was not unlike in power, though far different in spirit, what Cromwell showed when he dissolved the Long Parliament ; what Lord Chatham exhibited when he brought the whole House of Commons in submission to his feet ; or, better still, what a greater man than they all exhibited, when he made Felix tremble. And yet there was nothing harsh, or uncourteous ; nothing to mar the harmony of the occasion. I shall never forget how one high official in the President's suite turned aside and covered his face to conceal his emotions. The reply of the President was easy and fluent (for he was himself a gifted speaker) ; but after what had been said by the Doctor, it seemed but the small pattering of rain after the bolt that has prostrated the giant oak. The audience felt that the wrongs of Rhode Island had been avenged in a sentence, and realized how much greater the president of a college may be than the President of the United States.

On commencement days, the stranger had no occasion to inquire who was president; and it was a pardonable vanity, if the friends of the college looked with some degree of pride upon their representative on these occasions. The ceremony of conferring the degrees, which is too often so shabbily performed, was executed by Dr. Wayland in a style of graceful dignity which I have never seen equalled. It is not strange, that almost every one who has had anything to say about him, compares him to the Olympian Jupiter. His form on these public occasions might well have inspired the opening of the eighth Iliad, or served as a model for Phidias; but when he descended from the desk to the platform to present to the corporation the candidates for degrees, so august was his appearance, it was not strange that an audience, tired out by four hours of essays and orations, forgot its weariness, and listened even to the well-worn Latin formulary with an attention that would have honored the lips and the language of Cicero.

" Sage he stood,  
With Atlantean shoulders fit to bear  
The weight of mightiest monarchies; his look  
Drew audience and attention still as night,  
Or summer's noontide air."

It is this attitude which the college has wisely chosen to commit to canvas, to teach the stranger

what forms of nobleness have presided in its halls, and remind its returning sons of virtues which have become its boast, and which it would have perpetuated

"Quem inanem sacra verat — caussam lacrimis."

The candidates, too, as they passed in well ordered files before their revered instructor, and received from his hand their diplomas, and heard from his lips the familiar "*auctoritate mihi commissa*," would feel that they were indeed raised a degree in the scale of being.

"And home returning, soothly swear,  
Was never scene so *grand* and fair."

The teaching of Dr. Wayland was not confined to the college. As, while he remained in the pulpit, his sermons were demanded for the benefit of the world, so when he took the professor's chair; his instructions were soon required for the country as well as for the college. The President of Brown University is, *ex officio*, Professor of Moral and Intellectual Philosophy. At the very beginning of his administration, therefore, his attention was directed to these subjects. It was his duty to teach, and, of course, he must teach well; and thorough teaching requires thorough preparation. He at once began to meddle with subjects rather than with books; he



sought light from within more than from without. He studied the human soul more than theories and systems. The results of these investigations he committed to writing ; not so much (perhaps not at all, in the first instance) with a view to publication, as to give definiteness and distinctness to his own views. These studies with his senior class in Moral Science, grew, in the course of eight years, to an independent treatise, and were published in 1835, and for more than a generation have been the standard authority in American colleges in Moral Science. The history of his Treatise on Political Economy is the same as the preceding ; it grew from year to year as he taught successive classes, and has become an authority. In both these departments he was a pioneer. . He was the first to furnish for American colleges text-books in moral science and political economy, which passed into general use, and which have stood the test of experience, and not yielded in the ordeal of competition through which they have passed. His Intellectual Philosophy was published much later, and has had a much less extensive circulation than the above-mentioned works. Its history, however, is the same. It was written and re-written for his classes, and finally published. He was no book-maker, no mere compiler ; he was an author ; he published, not with a view to profit, but in the hope either of adding to the sum of human knowledge

or giving a better classification and expression to truths already known. He wrote, too, for young men in college; he aimed not to see how exhaustive theories and systems might be devised; he had no purpose of solving those enigmas which have taxed the cunning and wisdom of a hundred generations, and seem likely to tax those of a hundred more; he felt that this was not his sphere; he had little respect for sophists and scholastics, for nominalists and realists, utopians and transcendentalists, whether at Athens or Alexandria, in the twelfth or nineteenth centuries. To waste the time of students in mere dialectics, with a whole lifetime of plain practical duty before them; to teach them to use foils simply, when life's stern battle was raging all around them; to lead them through the labyrinths of exploded theories, when the avenues of known truths were opening to those waiting to be revealed,—seemed to him a gross perversion of the brief period allotted to the college curriculum. He was, therefore, not disturbed by criticisms upon his metaphysical abilities. He was willing to leave all these matters where Milton has left them, to occupy the minds of those who had no taste for higher duties.

“Others apart sat on a hill retired,  
In thoughts more elevate, and reasoned high  
Of Providence, foreknowledge, will, and fate;  
Fixed fate, free-will, foreknowledge, absolute,

And found no end, in wondering mazes lost.  
Of good and evil much they argued then,  
Of happiness and final misery,  
Passion and apathy, and glory and shame,—  
Vain wisdom all, and false philosophy !  
Yet, with a pleasing sorcery, could charm  
Pain for a while or anguish, and excite  
Fallacious hope, or arm the obdured boast  
With stubborn patience as with triple steels."

Like Raphael and Abdiel, Dr. Wayland preferred to toil at the great tasks of duty; to seek increase of knowledge by greater fidelity in service; to solve the problems of doctrine by doing His will from whom all truth proceeds. It was his greatness and his glory, that he was desirous to be useful rather than to become famous. And who shall measure the breadth and depth of his influence? What finite mind shall tell the streams of life that have flowed from his tongue and from his pen? Who shall say what higher views of duty, what stronger motive forces, have been awakened by more than one hundred thousand copies of his *Moral Science*, for which the world has called? Who will determine the limit of his sway over the civil and political history of the nation for the last thirty years? Who can fix, by "mete and bound," the clearer views of public economy, of finance and trade, which have resulted from the fifty thousand copies of his *Political Economy*, which have touched

the springs of national life in the school, in the college, in the counting-room, and in the legislative assembly?

As an educator, Dr. Wayland was practical, — eminently practical; but not so pre-eminently so as to overlook the importance of improvement in means and methods. He was the first to call the attention of the public to the importance of improving and enlarging the course of study in our colleges. His "Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System in the United States," were published in 1842. It was received with the respect that was due to the author, but not with the attention that was due to the subject. During the twenty-five years that have passed since the publication of that volume, there has been much thoughtful discussion, and much loose talk upon the subject. But I am much in error if it is not by far the most thorough examination of the whole ground that has yet been made. He labored under the disadvantage of being just twenty-five years in advance of his generation, and his book was received with a coldness which, I doubt not, disappointed him. His efforts to realize in the college under his care the improvements which he had marked out, were not attended with all the success which he had hoped for. He had so carefully examined the subject himself, had given to it the best portion of his life, had viewed college

education not only within college walls, but in its bearings upon society at large; had studied it not only in America, but had gone to the universities of the Old World, from which our own are derived; it had, in short, become so familiar to his own mind, that he did not realize how far he had left his age behind him. But there is not now a college in New England that is not, according to its ability, adopting the substance, if not the form, of his policy. The great truth which he so clearly saw, is now beginning to produce visible results; viz., that, in this country, the colleges must make provision for something more than the three learned professions; that, if they are to retain their hold upon the public confidence, they must provide for all the great interests of society. The plan which he submitted to the corporation of Brown University for the enlargement of its course of study and re-organization, will yet be seen to be one of the fairest monuments to his ability and wisdom. The whole matter was to him not only a subject of anxiety, but, I had almost said, of agony. He shrunk from the step which he took, until he felt that longer delay would be cowardice. He bore with firmness the toils and the pains of a grand experiment, but did not live to see its triumphant success.

The labors of Dr. Wayland were mainly in what is termed the higher departments of teaching, but

his sympathies extended to every other department. He was a prominent member of the committee for re-organizing the public schools of Providence, and had large influence in giving them their present form of unsurpassed excellence. It was always with him a labor of love to aid by his presence or counsel, or even in a more substantial manner, the cause of public instruction. Under his direction, Brown University was, I believe, the first of American colleges to make distinct provision for the education of teachers by establishing a professorship of Didactics.

I have already termed Dr. Wayland the AMERICAN ARNOLD. I must justify the comparison.

In every aspect of their characters, there is a striking resemblance between the Head Master of Rugby and the President of Brown University; and but for the fact that both these men were living in the world at the same time, we might, in studying their personal and professional history, find an argument for the Pythagorean metempsychosis. The very contrasts that mark these men will be seen to result more from their surroundings than from any inherent difference. Place Francis Wayland in the English church, in English society, educate him at Winchester and Oxford, and establish him over an English grammar school, and you would have a Thomas Arnold in every essential feature. Put



Thomas Arnold in America, and educate him as a republican and a dissenter, and place him at the head of a New-England college, and you would have another Francis Wayland. The conservative radicalism, the liberal toryism, the orthodox heresies, the consistent contradictions, which marked these men, and made them the political, theological, and ecclesiastical Ishmaelites of their respective spheres, while all were ready to bow down in admiring wonder at the purity of their lives, the boldness of their aims, the strength of their intellects, and the splendor of their achievements, could have resulted only from a remarkable likeness of mental structure, — a likeness not fancied, but real; not forced, but which forces itself upon the notice of every one familiar with the lives of these lights of their generation. They were both clergymen, and they were both teachers; and both, as clergymen and teachers, waged earnest and successful war against the shortcomings of their ecclesiastical and educational connections. They were both politicians, not in the party, but in the Christian sense of the term. They were both philanthropists; and the fruits of their philanthropy were seen alike in their own neighborhoods and at their antipodes. They were both scholars; and the fruits of their scholarship were shown, not in pedantic displays of useless learning, but in the moral elevation of both England and

America ; by the loftier and purer principles which they infused into society through their respective departments. They were both Christians ; and, as Christians, exhibited the noblest types of manhood, and did much to free their churches from the dogmatism of the schools, and restore them to the simplicity of the early Christian faith and the devotion of the early Christian practice. They were both sectarians, in a good sense ; but they loved the peculiarities of their sects just as the true soldier loves the flag of his regiment, but leaves it, without a pang, to sustain the flag of his country.

Born at the interval of less than a twelvemonth, and passing through their academic and professional curricula with similar success, they were called the same year to preside, as head master and president, over institutions whose condition in both cases required a master hand and a master mind. They both received their appointments as tributes to their personal and professional worth. Wayland had already startled all Christendom by his eloquent plea for a world lying in wickedness, and called the attention of American Christians, in words no less persuasive, to the duties which they owed to their country. Arnold was less known to fame, but was already at work, with his native ardor, upon his great problem of church and state — his *ἡ πολιτικὴ* as he termed it — and had already published a volume of

sermons breathing the same spirit as Wayland's, in which he tells us he aims to bring the principles of the gospel home to the practices of his own country in his own time. The course of study at Rugby sent Arnold to the Greek and Roman classics and history; to Thucydides and Herodotus, to Livy and Tacitus. The course of study at Providence sent Wayland to metaphysics and moral and political philosophy; to Locke and Butler, to Adam Smith and Dugald Stewart. The stand-point of the English head master was history; that of the American president was philosophy; and he who shall write the history of Christian thought and effort of English and American education for the present century, must deal largely with the views, and follow closely the labors, of Thomas Arnold and Francis Wayland. To Arnold we are indebted for the infusion of a new spirit into history; for showing us that God reigned in Italy as well as in Judea; and that he had a purpose on the Palatine as well as on Zion. From Wayland we have learned, in concise and classic prose, what Cowper had already taught us in poetry, — that

“Philosophy, baptized

In the pure fountain of eternal love,  
Has eyes indeed; and, viewing all she sees  
As meant to indicate a God to men,  
Gives him his praise, and forfeits not her own.”

From Arnold we have the standard edition of his favorite Thucydides — the results of his labors with his sixth form not to teach Greek accent and syntax merely, but to show us the great laws that direct the course of human societies. From Wayland we have his lessons to his senior class, in compact systems of ethics, metaphysics, and economics ; not in the spirit of Plato's Republic, the New Atlantis, or the Utopia, but to meet the wants of living men, beset with dangers and destined to immortality. In these different courses of thought and action, they often pass each to the sphere of the other, when we see more clearly the oneness of spirit which inspired them both. Where shall we find in Arnold so eloquent pages — even upon his favorite topics — as Wayland has given us upon the subjects of Greek and Roman story ; or where, in Wayland, keener moral analyses, or juster precepts, than in Arnold's portraits of Roman life and character ? Where has the historian paid so graceful a tribute to the genius of Homer and the perfection of the Roman law, or sketched with such beauty and precision the powers of the Greek language, as we find in the writings of the philosopher ? And where has the philosopher shown us more of moral discernment and ethical skill than the historian in his treatment of the Scipios and Hannibal, of Cæsar and Pompey ?

Quite similar were the results of the labors of the

two upon their respective institutions. The Rugby Grammar School and the Brown University of 1827 and 1845, were as unlike as the steam engines of the Marquis of Worcester and James Watt. The Master of Rugby has fully justified the prediction of Dr. Hawkins, that he would change the face of education all through the public schools of England. The views of Dr. Wayland are now revolutionizing our American colleges. The distinction of both was gained, not by learning, but by wisdom; not by boundless stores of knowledge, but by a judicious husbandry and wise direction of what many have possessed; but few have been able to use. We find not in Arnold the vast and varied acquirements of Niebuhr, Poison, nor Parr; nor in Wayland, the dazzling parade of theories and opinions, that we do in Whewell and Hamilton. They esteemed it, to use the language of Wayland, more important "to teach what was true, than to point out what was exploded, discuss what was doubtful, or disprove what was false;" yet none had a truer reverence for useful learning, while they regarded with a common contempt all merely pedantic display.

They both admired the gorgeous exuberance of genius and learning, which could produce *L'Allegro*, *Il Penseroso*, and *Comus*, then leave the haunts of the Muses of twenty years, and make all Europe "ring from side to side" in liberty's defence;

"And when depressed with age, beset with wrongs,  
When fallen on evil days and evil tongues,"

in obscurity and neglect, in blindness and poverty,  
would

"Argue not  
Against Heaven's hand or will, nor bate a jot  
Of heart or hope; but still bear up and steer  
Right onward;"

and give to England's and the world's literature, those seraphic anthems that tell us how Paradise was lost and regained: and they alike lamented that Gray's Elegy and a few flowers of poesy should be the only fruits of a profusion of learning which placed their author far in advance of the scholars of his time; with Shakespeare, they esteemed mere learning to be a "horde of gold kept by the devil;" and with Solomon, they prayed for understanding hearts, to enable them to discern between good and evil.

They fought with equal courage against the evil with which they found themselves in contact. With a charity that suffered long, and was kind, Arnold was yet willing "to have it out" with the Oxford malignants, in close fight, as in a saw-pit; and Wayland earnestly but vainly strove to teach his countrymen the truths of the New Testament, respecting slavery. "I must write or die," said Arnold, in



view of the evils which he saw in church and state. "I dread it as I should dread a flogging," said Wayland to a friend; "but I feel that I ought to try to do something."

The great central aim of both was the same; it was moral excellence. To this commanding quality all others were held subordinate. As a consequence, the intellectual excellence of their pupils soon became apparent, for intellectual excellence must of necessity follow moral. In the words of the Great Teacher, they sought for their pupils first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and to this all other things were added.

"It soon began to be a matter of observation to us in the university," said Dr. Moberly, of Oxford, in speaking of Arnold, "that his pupils brought quite a different character with them to Oxford from that which we knew elsewhere; his pupils were thoughtful, manly-minded, conscious of duty and obligation; and we looked on Dr. Arnold as exercising an influence for good all through the public schools of England." Judge Story, of the Cambridge Law School, said he could distinguish a pupil of Dr. Wayland's, by his superior power of "seizing upon the essential points of a case and freeing it from all extraneous matters." "That man preaches like a pupil of Dr. Wayland," said a gentleman, after listening to an able discourse from a

clergyman, who was an entire stranger to him ; and, on inquiry, he found that he was a graduate of Brown University.

They both felt the same interest, and bore the same distinguished part in every political, religious, and benevolent movement of their times. They both felt the justice of that sentiment of Terence, which once shook the Roman theatre with applause :

“Homo sum ; et nihil humani, a me alienum puto.”

“I am a man, and I feel an interest in all that pertains to humanity.” This intense interest in all the questions of the outward world, gave the greater importance to their academic labors. They saw in their pupils, not scholars or metaphysicians merely, but citizens, statesmen, and *men* ; and their pupils in turn looked up to them, not as scholars or scholastics, who in their academic seclusion, had renounced the world, and were dealing only in philological niceties and metaphysical subtleties, but as the teachers of the civilized world as well as themselves.

Their views of discipline were the same. “The first, second, and third duty of the teacher,” said Arnold, “is to get rid of unpromising subjects.” The same policy with Wayland made him seem harsh and despotic, when he was acting only for what he considered the highest welfare of the college.

They enjoyed a similar triumph. It was a scene which Oxford had never witnessed, when Thomas Arnold, after long years of persecution, obloquy, misrepresentation, and abuse, went up to pronounce his inaugural discourse as Professor of Modern History. It was one of those peaceful triumphs of the mind; a moral victory over passion and prejudice which outshines all the glories of war, which was witnessed in the Oxford Theatre, when all that was most brilliant, all that was most wise and most distinguished, gathered there to greet the Head Master of Rugby, who had obeyed the mandate of his sovereign, to go back to his university, and turn her courses of thought into new channels; to rebuke her tendency to mediævalism; to teach them that, from the past, something more is to be learned than the rites and ceremonies which have symbolized human thought,—the ceremonies which the spirit has cast off,—to turn their minds from all this, and teach them the great significance of the past, as a part of God's manifestation of his character through his Providence, as we now read it in the writings of her Jowetts and her Stanleys. I have said it was a triumph; it was more than a triumph; it was an *era*. When Thomas Arnold walked up to the rostrum with that quick step and manly dignity which so delighted those who had loved him when all the world despised him, and which disarmed even the

bitterness of theological hatred, it was a new era that dawned upon Oxford. It marked, by well-defined limits, the end of the great tractarian reaction, and the beginning of the school of progress; it was the turning point between the movement which was begun by Newman and Pusey, — the party of “millinery and upholstery,” as Carlyle terms it, — and the party that is now revolutionizing and elevating English feeling and English thought. In that vast concourse of learning, rank, and talent, that filled the Sheldonian Theatre, there sat an undergraduate of Brazenose College, his spirit chafing with disappointment in not having been able to satisfy the patriotic ardor of his soul by joining the army, but who then saw in the moral hero of this occasion a sublimity and a power that determined the whole course of his future life. Those who have hung with rapture upon the spoken or printed words, or followed with admiring wonder, the life of Frederick W. Robertson, may think of Arnold’s inaugural lecture as the hour when that pure spirit first became conscious of its high destiny.

The triumph of the American Arnold came later in life. He had taught almost an entire generation of pupils, and had quietly signified his purpose to spend the evening of his days in the more private pursuit of those great objects to which his life had been devoted. The knowledge of this purpose and

of the fact that it was fixed, was an effective summons to many hundreds of grateful pupils, and to the community at large, to signalize his retirement from his long period of academic service, by an ovation proportioned in some degree to the magnitude of the services that had been rendered. No college in New England has witnessed a scene like that which was exhibited at the annual commencement of Brown University, in 1855. The address of the Corporation to the retiring President was most eulogistic; but the scene of most touching and imposing interest was at the college dinner. There were gathered a body of alumni more numerous and more honored, perhaps, than any New-England president could ever have claimed as *his own*. There were in that assembly, a collection of scholars, jurists, and divines, the brightest ornaments of public and private life, who had come, from a common impulse of gratitude, to celebrate this day of their teacher's triumph, and what was destined to become one of the illustrious days in the history of their *alma mater*. When Francis Wayland rose before that assembly, and looked down upon the fruits of nearly thirty years of earnest and successful labor; when he called to mind the contumely and scorn with which he had been greeted at the outset; the opposition which had well-nigh conquered even his invincible spirit; when he could calmly face that

imposing presence, and say as he did, in alluding to those years of trial and toil, —

“Gentlemen, I feel no disposition to boast, in reviewing my labors with you. I have but very imperfectly realized my own ideal of what a teacher should be; but this I can say, I have tried to do my duty. There have been times when you thought me severe, and even tyrannical; there have been times, I doubt not, when you thought me harsh, and, in the performance of the severer forms of discipline, were inclined to look upon me as a *regular old despot, who did it because he loved it*. But I assure you, gentlemen, that the Searcher of all Hearts only knows the anguish of spirit which those duties have cost me. And this I must be allowed to say, in justice to myself, that I have dismissed no student from college whom I would retain, if I were to go over the ground again; but I have retained many whom I wish I had sent away.”

When, from these same men to whom these brave words were spoken with a voice that struggled with emotion, he received the hearty tribute, one speaking for all, —\*

“I have seen, and have had other eminent masters. Joseph Story, whose name is identified with the jurisprudence of his country; John Hooker Ashnum, who left behind him no superior in Massa-

\* Judge Thomas, of the Supreme Court of Massachusetts.



chusetts, whose mind had the point of the diamond, and the clearness of its waters; Pliny Merrick, who graces the bench on which I have the honor to sit. A quarter of a century has passed since I left these walls with your blessing. I have seen something of men and of the world since. I esteem it the happiest event of my life that I was permitted for three years to sit at the feet of your instruction.

“Others may speak and think of the writer and the scholar: my tribute is to the great teacher; and he is not the great teacher who fills the mind of his pupil from the affluence of his learning, or works much for him, but who has the rare faculty of drawing out and developing the mind of another, and making him work for himself,—the rarest of all God’s gifts to men. Great statesmen, great orators, great jurists, are successful and useful in the degree that they are great teachers. Office of unequalled dignity and worth! Even our divine Lord and Master we call the ‘Great Teacher.’ Mr. President, if I have acquired any consideration in my own beloved Commonwealth; if I have worthily won any honor, I can, and do, with a grateful heart, bring them to-day and lay them at your feet; ‘*Teucro duce et auspice Teucro.*’”

When, I say, a scene like this was exhibited at the close of a public life-work, it was, to a virtuous

mind, far more impressive than any, or all, of the three hundred triumphs of the Eternal City.

It is fit for us to recall and record these characters and events which have shed imperishable glory upon our profession; it is more than fit: it is obligatory. These men have labored, and we have entered into their labors. And while we are surrounded with the din and dust of the conflict; while we encounter persecution and contempt, obloquy and scorn, as some of us have within the past year, we may turn to the bright examples of those who have fought a good fight, and finished their course, and are now ascended into the pure empyrean of fame, "above the smoke and stir of this dim spot."

Especially is it our duty, as members of the American Institute of Instruction, to record the virtues and the professional success of those who founded it. Soon, too soon, alas! will the places that have known them, know them no more forever. Their well-earned fame is a large part of the influence that we have with this generation.

"Gentlemen, you have chosen a noble profession. What though it do not confer upon us wealth,—it confers upon us a higher boon, the privilege of being useful. What though it lead not to the falsely-named *heights* of political eminence, it leads us to what is far better, the sources of real power ;

for it renders intellectual ability necessary to our means. I DO VERILY BELIEVE THAT NOTHING SO CULTIVATES THE POWERS OF A MAN'S OWN MIND AS THOROUGH, GENEROUS, LIBERAL, AND INDEFATIGABLE TEACHING. But our profession has rewards, rich rewards, peculiar to itself. What can be more delightful to a philanthropic mind, than to behold intellectual power increased a hundred-fold by our exertions, talent developed by our assiduity, passions eradicated by our counsel, and a multitude of men pouring abroad over society, the lustre of a virtuous example, and becoming meet to be inheritors with the saints in light: and all in consequence of the direction which we have given to them in youth. I ask again what profession has any higher rewards?

“Again: we, at this day, are in a manner the pioneers in this work in this country. Education as a science has scarcely yet been naturalized among us. Radical improvement in the means of education is an idea that seems but just to have entered into men's minds. It becomes us to act worthily of our station. Let us by all the means in our power, second the efforts and the wishes of the public. Let us see that the first steps in this course are taken wisely. *This country ought to be the best educated on the face of the earth. By the blessing of Heaven we can do much towards the making of it so.*

*God helping us, then, let us make our mark on the rising generation."*

These, gentlemen, were the winged words which thirty-seven years ago, launched into existence the organization whose anniversary we now celebrate. They fell upon the fathers, then, from one radiant with promise and fired with Christian ardor. With what added power do they come to us, enforced by the example of a life that has indeed made its mark upon its age, and changed in large measure the character of American education! They were spoken, then, in behalf of a band of earnest men, striving in the spirit of faith and hope to organize the educational life of the nation; they seem now to come from the same spirit, amid the assembly of the just, where faith is turned to sight. Let us heed the encouraging exhortation: and when difficulties thicken, and friends fail; when the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint, turn to the bright examples of our early history,—to the Moses and the prophets of our educational dispensation,—and read in their triumph the assurance of our own success.

## APPENDIX.

---

### NOTE A.

THE honor of having originated the "Lyceum Lecture System" is claimed for three men, whose names are mentioned in the text; viz., Edward Everett, Josiah Holbrook, and Timothy Claxton. It is not, perhaps, a question of great importance, but is one of some interest. It was very likely quite as much the demand of the age as the creation of any one individual. But the claims of Mr. Everett to priority in this great movement, seem to be so well founded that I deem them worthy of notice; the more so, because of the absurd notion entertained by many, that Mr. Everett was not popular in his tastes and sympathies. Prof. Felton, in his admirable article on the educational services of Mr. Everett, in the seventh volume of Barnard's *Journal of Education*, makes the following quotation from a lecture by Ralph Waldo Emerson:—

"But a new field for eloquence has been opened in the Lyceum,—an institution not yet a quarter of a century old, yet singularly agreeable to the taste and habits of the New-England people, and extending every year to the South and West. It is of so recent origin that, although it is beginning already, like the invention of railways, to make a new profession, we have, most of us, seen all the steps of its progress. In New England, it had its origin in as marked a manner as such things admit of being marked, from the genius of one distinguished person, who, after his connection

with the university, read public courses of literary lectures in Boston. And this was an epoch of such note in the recent literary history of all that portion of the country, I shall ask leave to pause a little on the recollection. That individual has passed, long since, into new employments; so that the influence he then exerted, and which was a capital fact in the literary annals of the country, now fairly belongs to the past; and one of his old scholars will be indulged in recalling an image so pleasing. There was an influence on the young people, from the genius of this eminent scholar, which was almost comparable to that of Pericles, in Athens. He had an inspiration which did not go beyond his head, but which made him the master of elegance. If any of my audience were at that period in Boston or Cambridge, they will easily remember his radiant beauty of person, of a classic style; his heavy, large eye; marble lids, which gave the impression of mass which the slightness of his form needed; sculptured lips; a voice of such rich tones, such precise and perfect utterance, that, although slightly nasal, it was the most mellow, and beautiful, and correct, of all the instruments of the time. The word that he spoke, in the manner in which he spoke it, *became current and classical in New England*. He had a great talent for collecting facts, and for bringing those he had to bear with ingenious felicity on the topic of the moment. Let him rise to speak, on what occasion soever, a fact had always just transpired, which composed with some other fact well known to the audience, a most pregnant and happy coincidence. It was remarked that, for a man that threw out so many facts, he was seldom convicted of a blunder. He had a good deal of special learning, and all his learning was available for the purposes of the hour. It was all new learning, that wonderfully took and stimulated the young men. It was so coldly and



weightily communicated from so commanding a platform, as if the consciousness and consideration of all history and all learning, adorned with so many simple and austere beauties of expression, and enriched with so many excellent digressions and significant quotations, that, though nothing could be conceived beforehand less attractive, or, indeed, less fit for green boys from Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts, with their unripe Latin and Greek reading, than exegetical discourses in the style of Hug, and Wolf, and Ruhnken, on the Orphic and ante-Homeric remains, yet this learning instantly took the highest place, to our imagination, in our unoccupied American Parnassus. All his auditors felt the extreme beauty and dignity of the manner; and even the coarsest were contented to go punctually to listen for the manner, when they had found out that the subject matter was not for them. In the lecture-room, he abstained from all ornament, and pleased himself with the play of detailing erudition in a style of perfect simplicity."

Mr. Emerson graduated at Cambridge, in 1821, and the lectures above mentioned must have been in full operation at that time. Mr. Claxton did not reach this country until 1823; and it is at a still later period that the establishment of the first Lyceum at Millbury has been claimed for Mr. Holbrook. There was, doubtless, a considerable difference between the lectures of these men. The efforts of Messrs. Holbrook and Claxton were directed mainly to elementary science. Mr. Everett, fresh from the classic fields of Europe, was, doubtless, little inclined to meddle with air-pumps and electric machines. It is nevertheless true that Mr. Everett did much to popularize science.

I am the more inclined to speak an humble word in regard to Mr. Everett, from having seen in a prominent religious journal, recently, the remark that Mr. Everett never came in

contact with the people until he wrote for the *New York Ledger*. It is somewhat difficult to understand what this writer means by "coming in contact with the people." If he means that kind of contact that is gained in corner grocery-stores and basement bar-rooms, it is doubtless true that Mr. Everett was not popular in his habits and sympathies. But if a hearty sympathy with every enterprise intended to elevate and inform the masses of society, and a willingness to labor for its success, be any indication of sympathy with the people, few can urge stronger claims to that virtue than Edward Everett. In the three published volumes of Mr. Everett's addresses, there are one hundred and twenty-seven orations and speeches. At least two thirds of these are strictly popular addresses, and about one half expressly intended for the promotion of agriculture and the mechanic arts. The number that can be ranked as exclusive, if, indeed, any can be so ranked, is very small. Of how many men can it be said with more truth than of Mr. Everett, that the common people heard him gladly?

In the cause of popular education, Mr. Everett was one of the stanchest and steadiest champions. Ten of his published speeches are upon this subject exclusively; but it pervades them nearly all. In those masterpieces of eloquence which gained him such renown a generation since his orations before the educated men of the land gathered at Harvard, Yale, and Amherst, it is not the eloquence of the cloister merely that glows upon his lips; the great cause of popular education, through him,

"Claimed kindred there, and had its claims allowed."

And when he pleaded for the colleges, as he sometimes did to the deaf ears of legislative committees, it was because he saw the vast service of these institutions to the people; it was

because he saw in the action and re-action of the colleges and schools upon each other the great *systole* and *diastole* of our intellectual and national life.

Nor is this all. It was not upon the platform and in theory merely that Mr. Everett subserved the cause of public instruction. As a father and as a citizen, he exemplified every word of his public teaching. As a patron of the public schools of Boston and Cambridge, he has earned the lasting gratitude of those communities.

I would gladly occupy a page or two in relating incidents from actual experience of Mr. Everett's fidelity as a father, in his relation to the public schools. Nothing but ill health was allowed to stand in the way of his son's attendance upon school. Pleasure, friends, festive occasions, public celebrations, all gave way, when the school required it. "You will not be at school on the seventeenth," I said to his son, a few days before Mr. Everett gave his oration at Charlestown on the seventy-fifth anniversary of the battle of Bunker Hill. "Why not," he replied, with a look of surprise, "will not school keep?" — "Yes," I said, "I suppose so." — "Then I shall come to school," he answered, with decision. And this when the whole community was on the tiptoe of expectation for the coming event; when a great historic oration was to be pronounced, and the orator was to be Edward Everett. These unostentatious virtues are worthy of record, and enable us to view the scholar, the orator, the magistrate, the senator, the diplomatist, the patriot, with the greater admiration, when we see him "travel on life's common way in cheerful godliness," and appear as great as a father and a citizen, as in the halls of Congress or at the Court of St. James. I have seen quite different men. I have seen a man noisy, strenuous, eloquent even, in his advocacy of public schools, making loud appeals

for educational reform, always ready for a speech, seldom performing a duty; always pointing to the right way, while travelling himself in a contrary direction; talking loudly of sacrifices, but when the sacrifice came he was sure to be the priest, never the victim; starving for want of meat with four thousand dollars a year; claiming all the honors of martyrdom but the sufferings; striving with the zeal of an apostle for the education of the world, and never visiting the school-rooms at his own door; on the public platform the panegyrist of the public school, yet sending his own children to private instruction; to the teachers of his children captious, dictatorial, querulous, and meddlesome; to the teacher in the abstract generous, plausible, deferential, and courteous; claiming to be an authority on all educational matters in the nation, ignorant of the condition of his own neighborhood; loud in his denunciation of corporal punishment to the public, but giving private directions to have boys "stripped and flogged;" in short, I have seen a man all things to all men in a sense very different from the apostolic; "stealing the livery of heaven to serve the devil in;" a saint abroad and a mischief-maker at home. And I have seen another man, modest, gentle, learned, and wise, descend from the highest official stations, enrobed with all the honors of the schools; I have seen him claim no privilege for his own child more than he would ask for that of the humblest day laborer; I have seen him when summoned by his neighbors, lay aside the pen, or leave the "still air of delightful studies," and go to the school-room, and from morn

"To noon he sat, from noon to dewy eve,  
A summer's day."

listening with a patience that surprised even teachers, to the recitations and declamations, the successes and failures of

school-boys and school-girls. And then with such words of kindness and encouragement would he speak; with such nice adaptation to the wants of parents, teachers, and pupils; that the lips which had commanded the "applause of listening senates," seemed trained only for the most effective parochial service, and the statesman disappeared in the clergyman. From a scene like this I have seen parents retire with moist eyes and joyful hearts; committee-men with an air of strength and encouragement; and pupils with a cheerfulness and buoyancy of spirit that gave promise of triumph over life's trials and obstacles.

Would that the example of Mr. Everett were more generally followed.

A good article on the origin of the Lyceum Lecture System may be found in the eighth volume of *Barnard's Journal of Education*, p. 249, *et seq.*

## NOTE B.

Some further notice of the committee of arrangements for the convention in August, which was organized into the American Institute of Instruction, seems desirable.

MR. EBENEZER BAILEY was born in West Newbury, Mass., June 25, 1795. He was graduated with honor at Yale College, September 17, 1817. He taught first in Virginia, then in Newburyport. In 1823, he was appointed head master of the Franklin School for boys, in Boston. In November, 1825, he became the first master of the High School for girls, which was established as an experiment. He established, while in this school, a high reputation as a teacher. This school was discontinued, mainly in consequence of the opposition of the elder Josiah Quincy. On leaving this school, he established a Young Ladies' Private School, which received a large share of public patronage.

He was the author of the following approved school-books:

The Young Ladies' Class-Book. Boston, 1831, 1833; Revised Edition, 1857 (15th Edition, 1837).

First Lessons in Algebra. Boston, 1833; Revised Edition, 1835; 31st Edition, 1853.

Key to the above. Boston.

Bakewell's Philosophical Conversations. Boston, 1833.

He also published a pamphlet of considerable importance, entitled, "Review of the Mayor's Report," on the Subject of Schools, as far as relates to the High School for Girls. Pp. 54. He died at Lynn, in 1839.



BENJAMIN DUDLEY EMERSON was graduated at Dartmouth College, in 1805. He taught at Newburyport; and in 1819, became master of the Adams School, in Boston. He remained in this school for nine years, and then engaged in private classical instruction. Mr. Emerson is still living, at the advanced age of eighty-eight.

He published the following school-books:—

Introduction to the National Spelling Book. Boston, 1818.

National Spelling Book. Boston, 1828, 1831; 70th Edition, 1830; 100th Edition, 1841, 1842, 1851; 170th Edition, no date. Hartford, 1820; Concord, 1830; also, New York.

First Class Reader. Boston, 1833, 1834; 10th Edition, 1835. Windsor, Vt., 1st Edition, 1834.

Second Class Reader. Boston, 1834. Claremont, 1830.

Third Class Reader. Boston, 1834, 1836.

Progressive Primer.

Fourth Class Reader. Claremont, 1846. Boston, 1835. Philadelphia,—.

Academical Speaker. Boston, New Edition, 1831.

Outlines of Geography and History. Boston (date?).

ABRAHAM ANDREWS was for many years the esteemed and successful master of the Bowdoin School, in Boston. I am not aware that he has published anything.

GEORGE BARRELL EMERSON is one of the most prominent names in the history of education in Massachusetts. He was born in Wells, Me., in 1797, and was graduated at Harvard College in 1817, in the same class with George Bancroft, Caleb Cushing, Rev. Dr. Stephen H. Tyng, Samuel Joseph May, and others, who have attained to distinguished eminence and usefulness. He was tutor at Cambridge for two years (1819-1821). In 1821, he became the first master of the English High School, in Boston; remained in the school for

two years, and then established a private school for girls, which he conducted with eminent success for more than thirty years. While engaged in the arduous duties of the school-room, Mr. Emerson has found time to render the most effectual aid in all the most important educational movements for the last fifty years.

He was a leader in the movement which resulted in the establishment of the Board of Education, served the whole time allowed by law as a member, and was seven years its treasurer. It is worthy of special notice that while Mr. Emerson has enjoyed the largest patronage of the wealthier inhabitants of Boston, he has constantly labored for the welfare of the public schools. His sympathies have always been warmly enlisted in this great work, and he has ever manifested an interest in everything pertaining to the improvement of the teacher's profession. When the time shall come for his biography to be fully written, it will be seen that he has earned a place in the foremost rank of American

*"Tarda sit illæ dies et nostro serior ævo."*

teachers. He was for eight years the President of the Institute. He received the honorary degree of Doctor of Laws from Brown University in 1858, and from Harvard College in 1859.

Mr. Emerson has published the following works:—

An edition of Sullivan's Political Class-book; Boston, 1831.

The School and the School Master (in connection with Bishop Potter).

A Manual of Agriculture. Boston, 1862 (in connection with C. L. Flint).

The Classical Reader (in connection with F. W. P. Greenwood). Boston, 1826, 1828, 1832, 1847.

The Trees and Shrubs of Massachusetts. (Published under the authority of the State of Massachusetts.)

GIDEON FRENCH THAYER was born in Watertown, Mass., in 1793. He is well known as the founder of the Chauncy Hall School, in Boston. During the first thirty years of the existence of the Institute, Mr. Thayer was one of its most active and efficient friends. There was so much of animation in his manner, he was so well bred, so fluent in debate, so active in all business matters, that he seemed to be quite an indispensable part of the association. I am not sure that he was not present at every meeting of the Institute while health and life permitted him to attend. In 1828, Mr. Thayer established the Chauncy Hall School, and conducted it with so much skill and energy as to gain a large share of patronage from the public. To Mr. Thayer, I think, more than to any other one man, we are indebted for the improvement in what are sometimes called the "minor morals" of school-boys. A thorough gentleman himself, he succeeded in making his pupils feel that courtesy and politeness were more manly than the rudeness and rowdyism which were formerly too common on the school premises. He was not merely a teacher; he was active as a religious man, and always ready for every good word and work. He did not receive a liberal education, but, as a tribute to his personal and professional worth, the honorary degree of Master of Arts was conferred upon him by Brown University (1854), and Harvard College (1855). He was for four years the President of the Institute, and twice gave lectures at its annual sessions. He also communicated to *Barnard's Journal of Education* a series of "Letters to a Young Teacher," which are very valuable, and have been published in a separate form. He died in 1863.

HENRY KEMBLE OLIVER was graduated at Harvard College in 1818, and was for many years the very successful principal of the High School for boys, in Salem, Mass. Since

leaving the profession of teaching, he has discharged with honor various important public trusts. He was the Treasurer of the State of Massachusetts during the recent war. He is still engaged in the public service.

J. WILDER was a teacher in Watertown, Mass. I have not been able to obtain more definite information respecting him.

## NOTE C.

It will be interesting to notice with some minuteness, the labors of the seventeen gentlemen who gave lectures before the Institute, at its first session in 1830.

Of FRANCIS WAYLAND it is not necessary further to speak, than to say that he has probably done more than any other one man, to teach the great principles of moral and intellectual philosophy and political economy, to the youth of America. His strictly educational works are as follows:

Elements of Moral Science. 1835.

The same, abridged. 1836.

Elements of Political Economy. 1837.

The same, abridged. 1837.

Elements of Intellectual Philosophy. 1854.

Thoughts on the Present Collegiate System in the United States.

Besides the above, he has published upwards of seventy books, pamphlets, or articles, on moral, religious, and political subjects. This bare statement will give some idea of the immense labors of his life. He never wrote unless he had something to say; and he never wrote anything that was not worth reading.

JOHN COLLINS WARREN, in medical education, was a pioneer. He belongs rather to the department of professional than public education; and the importance and extent of his services are too well known to require repetition here.

WILLIAM J. ADAMS was a teacher of eminence, in both the public and private schools of Boston.

SAMUEL READ HALL was born in Croydon, N. H., 1795. He is regarded as the first Principal of a Teacher's Seminary in this country. He was emphatically a teacher of teachers. He began his labors as a normal teacher, at Concord, Vt., in 1823, and remained there until 1830; then went to Andover, Mass., to take charge of the Teachers' Seminary there, and remained there until 1837; thence he removed to Plymouth, N. H., to take charge of what promised to be a Teachers' Seminary, with an ample endowment. The endowment failed, and the institution declined for want of means. He afterwards continued his work at Craftsbury Academy, in Craftsbury, Vt. Mr. Hall's publications were numerous:—

Geography and History of Vermont. 1827.

Lectures on School-keeping. 1829.

Child's Geography.

The Grammatical Assistant.

The School Arithmetic.

Lectures on Parental Responsibility and Religious Training.

A School History of the United States (and in connection with the Rev. A. R. Baker).

Lectures to Female Teachers.

Teacher's Gift, and

What Every Boy can Do.

WILLIAM RUSSELL stands high in the first class of American Teachers. He was born in Glasgow, Scotland, and was educated in the Latin School and University of that city. Coming to this country, he taught in a private family and in an academy, in Georgia; afterwards removed



to Connecticut, and taught the Hopkins Grammar School. In 1826, he became the editor of the *American Journal of Education*, and continued in this service for three years. He has been for many years the most approved teacher of Elocution in New England, and given instruction in many of our colleges and theological seminaries. He established a Teachers' Seminary in New Hampshire (1849); and in 1853, at Lancaster, Mass. He has published —

Suggestions on Education. New Haven, 1823.

A Grammar of Composition. New Haven, 1823.

An Edition of Adam's Latin Grammar. New Haven, 1824.

American Journal of Education. Vols. I., II., III. Boston, 1826, 1827, 1828.

A Manual of Mutual Instruction. Boston, 1826.

The Library of Education. Vol. I. Boston, 1830.

Journal of Instruction (semi-monthly). Philadelphia, 1831.

Lessons in Enunciation. Boston, 1830.

Rudiments of Gesture. Boston, 1838.

Exercises in Elocution. Boston, 1841.

The American Elocutionist. Boston, 1844.

Primer. Boston, 1844.

Spelling Book. Boston, 1844.

Primary Reader. Boston. 1844.

Sequel to the Primary Reader. Boston, 1844.

Introduction to the Primary Reader. Boston, 1845.

Introduction to the American Common School Reader and Speaker. Boston, 1845.

The American Common School Reader and Speaker. Boston, 1845.

The Introduction to the Young Ladies' Elocutionary Reader. Boston, 1845.

The Young Ladies' Elocutionary Reader. Boston, 1845.

Elements of Musical Articulation. Boston, 1845.

Lessons at Home in Spelling and Reading. Boston, 1846.

Orthophony. Boston, 1845.

Harper's New York Class-Book. New York, 1847.

New Spelling Book. Boston, 1852.

Pulpit Elocution. Andover, 1852.

A University Speaker. Boston, 1852.

Suggestions on Teachers' Institutes. Manchester, N. H., 1852.

A Manual of Instruction in Reading. Andover, 1852.

An Address on the Infant School System of Education. Boston, 1830.

An Address on Associations of Teachers. 1830.

A Lecture on Reading and Declamation. 1837.

A Lecture on Elocution. Boston, 1853.

A Lecture on the Education of Females. Andover, 1843.

A Lecture on Female Education. 1844.

Hints to Teachers on Instruction in Reading. 1846.

Duties of Teachers. 1850.

An Address at the Dedication and Opening of the New-England Normal Institute. 1853.

Encouragements to Teachers. 1853.

Exercises on Words. Boston, 1856.

JOHN PIERPONT (*clarum et venerabile nomen*) is too well known to fame to require extended notice. He was graduated at Yale College in 1804, in the same class with John C. Calhoun; first studied law, then became a merchant, and then entered the ministry. He was a member of the committee that drafted the plan for the English High School, and was for years an efficient member of the school-committee. He was the author of the following school-books: which are of great excellence:—

The American First Class Book.

The National Reader.

Introduction to the National Reader.

The Young Reader.

SAMUEL P. NEWMAN was professor of Rhetoric in Bowdoin College. He left his professorship to become the first principal of the Massachusetts State Normal School in Barre. He was the author of a treatise on Rhetoric and Political Economy.

JAMES GORDAN CARTER was born in Leominster, Massachusetts, in 1795. He was graduated at Harvard College in 1820; began teaching, immediately after leaving college, in Lancaster, Massachusetts. He was the first to sound the note of alarm and to call the attention of the people of this State to the importance of improving their public schools. No abler papers on this subject have appeared, than his Letters to the Hon. William H. Prescott, and his essays on Popular Education. It is forty years since they were published; and they might now be republished and distributed with great profit. Had Mr. Carter confined himself to the work of education strictly, the name of Horace Mann might never have been heard in connection with the cause of public instruction. He was the author of

Letters to the Hon. William H. Prescott on the Free Schools of New England. Boston, 1824.

Essays on Popular Education. Boston, 1826; and of the following school-books:—

Geography of Middlesex County. Cambridge, 1830 (in connection with William H. Brooks).

Geography of Massachusetts. Boston, 1830.

Geography of Worcester County. Boston, 1830.

Geography of Essex County. Boston, 1830.

Mr. Carter died at Chicago in July, 1849.

WARREN COLBURN was born in Dedham, Mass., in 1793; was graduated at Harvard College in 1820. He was an intimate friend of Mr. Carter, just mentioned. His mathematical abilities were of a high order; and from him dates the great improvement in the method of teaching that science in this country. On leaving college, he began teaching in Boston. He was a superior mechanic, and was soon drawn from the work of teaching by the claims of the rising interest of American manufactures. He was the author of the following school-books:

First Lessons in Reading and Grammar. Boston, 1831.

Second " " " " 1844.

Third " " " " 1844.

Fourth " " " " 1838.

First Lessons in Arithmetic. Boston, 1822.

First Lessons in Intellectual Arithmetic. Boston, —.

Arithmetic. Sequel to First Lessons. Boston, 1824.

A Key to the Sequel. Boston, 1826.

An Introduction to Algebra. Boston, 1825.

Key to " " " 1827.

"Colburn's First Lessons" is still sold at the rate of from seventy-five to a hundred thousand annually.

WILLIAM CHANNING WOODBRIDGE was born in Medford, Mass., in 1794, and graduated at Yale College in 1821, in the same class with Joseph E. Worcester, the lexicographer. His whole life was devoted to education. He sustains much the same relation to the study of geography that Warren Colburn does to that of arithmetic.

His smaller geography was published in 1825, and a larger work at a subsequent period, in connection with Mrs. Emma Willard, of Troy. He visited Europe three times, and studied the methods of instruction in the best schools. He spent nearly a year at Hofwyl; and on his return from his

second visit, he purchased the *American Journal of Education* of Mr. Russell, changed its name to the *Annals of Education*, and through this publication made the American public acquainted with the best methods of the European schools. Mr. Woodbridge was a man of superior intellectual and moral powers; but he was obliged to contend with feeble health during his whole life. He died at Frankfurt, in Germany, in 1840.

CORNELIUS CONWAY FELTON was born in West Newbury, Mass., in 1807; and graduated at Harvard College in 1827. He taught for a time, after leaving college, at the Round Hill School, in Northampton; was appointed tutor at Harvard in 1829; and Eliot Professor of Greek Literature in 1834; chosen President of Harvard University in 1860. He was a warm friend of public schools; and did much towards perfecting the public school system of Cambridge. He published —

A Greek Reader. Hartford, 1842.

Homer's Iliad. Boston, 1833.

The Birds of Aristophanes. Cambridge, 1855.

Clouds of Aristophanes. Cambridge, 1841.

Agamemnon of Æschylus. Boston, 1850.

• Panegyrics of Isocrates. Cambridge.

Selections from Greek Historians. Cambridge, 1852.

Selections from Modern Greek Writers. Cambridge, 1856.

An Edition of Smith's History of Greece. Cambridge, 1855.

Munk's Metres of the Greeks and Romans. Boston, 1843  
(in connection with Charles Beck).

WALTER ROGERS JOHNSON was born at Leominster, Mass., in 1794; and was graduated at Cambridge in 1819. He taught the Academy at Framingham for a time, then taught in a private school at Salem; removed to Germantown, Pa., and took charge of the academy there. He afterwards removed to Philadelphia; became connected with the Franklin Institute: and in this connection, established a Public High School (not free, nor supported by taxation). This school continued until the improvement of the public schools made it superfluous. He was among the foremost in the advocacy of improvements in the public school system, as will be seen from the following list of his published works on educational subjects:—

Thirteen Essays on Education, with Suggestions for Establishing a System of Common Schools in Pennsylvania. Harrisburg, 1822–3.

Six Essays on Education. 1823.

Observations on the Improvement of Seminaries of Learning in the United States. Philadelphia, 1825.

Remarks on the Legal Provisions for Education in Pennsylvania. 1826.

An Address, Introductory to a Course of Lectures in Mechanics and Natural Philosophy. 1828.

Introduction to the Greek Language, with a Key. 1829.

Remarks on the Duty of the Several States in Regard to Public Education. Philadelphia, 1830.

Lecture on the Importance of Lineal Drawing, and on the Method of Teaching the Art in Common Schools and other Seminaries. 1830.

Remarks on the Nature and Importance of Enlarged Education, in View of the Present State of Society in Europe and America. 1831.

A Concise View of the General State of Education in the United States. 1831.



Lecture on the Utility of Visible Illustrations. 1832.

Legislative Enactments of Pennsylvania, on the Subject of Education. 1833.

Remarks on the New York System of Education. 1833.

A Letter to Samuel Breck, on the subject of Common Schools, Manual Labor Schools, and Seminaries for Teachers. 1833.

A Lecture on Schools of Arts. Boston, 1835.

Memorial to the Congress of the United States, Praying for the Establishment of a National Institution. 1838.

Address Delivered at the Laying of the Corner-Stone of the Academy of Natural Sciences in Philadelphia. 1839.

A Lecture Introductory to a Course on Chemistry and Natural Philosophy in the Medical Department of Pennsylvania College. 1840.

Lecture on the Mechanical Industry and the Inventive Genius of America. 1849.

Mr. Johnson was also the author of numerous scientific papers, and gave much time to scientific investigation.

NEHEMIAH CLEVELAND was for nineteen years the Principal of Dummer Academy, in Byfield. He is the author of a very important history of that institution, entitled,

The First Century of Dummer Academy. A Historical Discourse at Newbury, Byfield Parish, Aug. 12, 1863. Boston, 1865.

FRANCIS J. GRUND was a German by birth, an eminent scholar, and the author of the following school-books:—

Elements of Natural Philosophy. Boston, 1832.

Exercises in Arithmetic. Boston, 1833.

Exercises in Algebra.

Key to Algebra. Boston, 1833.

318 THE FOUNDERS OF THE INSTITUTE.

Hirsch's Arithmetical and Algebraical Problems and Formulæ. Boston, 1831.

Elementary Treatise on Geometry, Part I. Boston, 1830.

" " " " II. Boston, 1831.

Elements of Chemistry. Boston, 1839.

Popular Lessons in Astronomy. Boston, 1839.

I am indebted for most of this information to that most valuable educational thesaurus, *Barnard's Journal of Education*.

## LECTURE VI.

---

### RIGHT-MINDEDNESS FAVORABLE TO INTELLECTUAL GROWTH.

BY A. A. MINER, D.D.

[Phonographic Report.]

AMONG the problems of education which every successive generation must resolve, practically as well as theoretically, for itself, there are not a few which are palpable, which lie upon the surface, which pertain to outward material things, and which are therefore readily resolved, and in regard to which a community of opinion and practice early prevailed.

There are others which are more abstruse and abstract; some of which are problems pertaining to the human mind itself. And, I believe, it is conceded by educators, that those problems which pertain exclusively to the human mind, are infinitely the most difficult and most important. These are often condemned because difficult.

In the discussion of the utility of classical studies, I think we overlook the fact, that their chief value

lies in bringing us in contact with the minds of other ages and other people. A language is the embodiment of a people's life. It involves the thought, the emotion, the ambition, aspiration, and moral sense of that people, and the retribution which God has visited upon them. He who reads the language of a race, reads the inner life of that race. It gathers up varied human experience, including the dealings of Providence with man.

The study of metaphysics, which is so often condemned, and which, it must be confessed, has still depths unexplored, involving problems yet unsolved, nevertheless, is probably more efficacious than any other branch of study, in toughening the powers, especially of those whose attainments prepare them for entering upon it, and in imparting comprehensiveness, elasticity, and clearness of perception and profundity of thought.

By right-mindedness, I mean more than a uniform and harmonious development of the various powers of man; I mean something aside from what we commonly indicate by singleness of purpose; something aside even from that more comprehensive formula embraced in the phrase, "True aim in study." For we may have a true aim in study, and yet labor under many difficulties; and we may have a singleness of purpose which is yet warped from the very subjects of study.

I mean that condition of the whole mind, not only in its ambition and aim, but in its very mood and spirit, which shall enable it to come in the best form and temper, to the study of whatever subject it enters upon. This condition of mind, our proposition affirms, is favorable to intellectual growth. I do not know but we ought to say it is an indispensable condition of such growth; for it is only in proportion to right-mindedness that intellectual growth can be attained at all. This is something quite aside from the simple natural growth of man, especially something different from the physical growth of man. While it is true that a sound mind requires a sound body, it is not true that a healthy physical growth necessarily involves a sound mind; nor does the mind correspond in its growth to the size of the physical frame. The observation of every educator must have convinced him, that there are minds of stalwart growth in feeble bodies, and robust frames with feeble intellectual powers. You may have perfect lungs, and a perfect stomach, and a good circulating apparatus; but with a diseased liver you immediately have disease in the whole system. You may have all the other organs of the physical economy sound; but with impaired lungs you soon have impaired general health. As in the physical economy there needs to be a co-operation of all the powers of

life; so in the intellectual economy all the powers should operate in harmony and in perfect sympathy.

When a vine, growing under unfavorable circumstances, meets in the running out of any of its branches with any material obstruction, you observe that, though impelled onward by its powers of growth, it is compelled to turn aside, and is thereby marred, damaged, and sometimes destroyed. So, in the exercise of our intellectual powers, if we run against some stubborn prejudice, it becomes an obstacle to the healthful development of the intellectual powers, and mars the beauty of the mind itself, leaving the student in a condition quite different from what he would otherwise occupy.

Look at political parties. What is the reason that hundreds and thousands of men, where common schools prevail, newspapers circulate, and books are in every man's hand, — how does it happen that, with all these advantages, with freedom to challenge the government, and dictate to the man of science, men still inherit their opinions, and continue them in families from generation to generation? How is it that we find the doctrine of State sovereignty impenetrable, and seeking to break down the government itself, in opposition to the leading facts of our history? How did this doctrine grow up in conflict with the idea of a general sovereignty, supreme in



certain respects, not indeed permitted to interfere with municipal regulations in other respects, yet sovereign in a general field, the whole people uttering their voices with the same imperiousness that they may in smaller communities on other subjects? I say, how does this happen, unless it is through the omnipotent power of prejudice, which turns aside the power of truth as the coat of mail turns aside the sword or the bullet?

Turn to the religious world. How is it that we find men living side by side, walking daily the same streets, going to their respective churches, as familiar with each other's thought as the children at school are with each other's faces, and yet holding views directly antagonistic to each other? What is it but some power closing the mind of the one party against receiving the views of the other? what is it but prejudice? It is not a want of sincerity. They may all desire to know the truth, yet they are not all penetrable by the same truths. There is something that makes them impervious thereto. It cannot be that the doctrine of endless sin and punishment on the one hand, and that of ultimate universal purity and salvation on the other hand, can be equally plausible. It cannot be, in the light of science to-day, in the light of universal charity and divine providence, manifest in every human soul, that these doctrines are equally plausible, and

equally well sustained, to human judgment and human understanding. It cannot be that these two classes of Christians can find equally definite supports of their respective views in the word of God. And yet we find men holding these views continually, travelling in their opposite ways; sensible men, agreeing in other respects, and laboring together in the pathways of charitable toil. What is the root of all this? There is an absence of that right-mindedness which is favorable to true spiritual growth.

There are other things besides prejudice, besides the coloring which education gives, which you have noticed here. We have seen, under a variety of circumstances, the influence which the condition of the human conscience exercises on the action of the intellect and understanding. Have you not known men, say at thirty years of age, already possessed of a competency through their own endeavors, with a growing family around them, with a bright path open before them, with luxurious homes, with every surrounding circumstance favorable to a noble course in life, who yet developed, as growing wealth increased temptation, some slight predominance of passion, which, bringing condemnation of conscience, disturbs the judgment, colors the entire intellectual and moral condition, and gradually turns them down the inclined plane, on

which they descend to overthrow and destruction? Have you never observed that when a criminal, a man hitherto unstained, first plunges into iniquity, his very reason becomes chaotic, and with a view to cover up the crime he proceeds in the best possible manner to reveal it, so that every word he utters, every act, points to him saying, "Thou art the man!" This would not be, if the mind were not disturbed by the conscience; it would not be if the conscience did not confuse and darken the reasoning powers.

Just as the conscience, thus warred upon, brings disturbance to the reasoning powers, so any false tone, or coloring, incompatible with the noblest spiritual condition, is an obstacle to intellectual growth. "It is not merely the sinning conscience, or the condemning conscience," that stands in the way. There is a morbid conscience which inflicts pain, even in the hours of utmost innocence; that will not allow us to rest when we should rest. There is many a sensitive woman, and many a child, disturbed from morning till evening, who never consciously transgressed a law. There is such a thing as a state of moral irritability; and without healthful exercise, and healthful, peaceful rest, there can be no really sound, solid, intellectual development.

There is another condition that illustrates the importance of right-mindedness. There are many

persons who have long cultivated the habit of seeing everything that transpires under their view in a fun-loving light. Let a saint, direct from heaven,—if such a character were ever met with,—utter the most sacred and divine sentiments, and at once they become the subject of a jest. Such a state of mind is entirely unfavorable to observing any fact and estimating it at its true value. Carry that state of mind into intellectual labors, and it will color every fact, warp the judgment, and be an obstacle to attainments which would otherwise be possible.

But I need not detain you longer in discussing the qualities of right-mindedness. Allow me to call attention to one or two practical applications of the subject to which we need to take heed. First, in our incitement of our pupils to effort, it is of great importance whether we employ the spirit of emulation in contrast with a fellow-student, or awaken a pure philosophic spirit; in other words, whether we make our pupil a mere emulator, or a lover of improvement. If you contrast his labor with that of another, sitting by his side, you cause him to compare himself with an object not related to his progress, and thus create an obstacle, so that he will be turned aside from that right line of effort which would bring the greatest success. It is of the utmost moment, that there should be

cultivated a genuine love of learning, for its own sake. And, as the child begins in its earliest trainings, so will it be likely to go on.

“Just as the twig is bent, the tree’s inclined.”

There is a custom widely prevalent, and which I am not prepared altogether to condemn, of awarding prizes, medals, diplomas, and other extraneous forms of seeming recompense, to the successful pupils in our various institutions of learning. They take the form of a reward of merit in our lower schools, of medals in the next higher, and of prizes in collegiate institutions. I do not stand here to say that a prize is a thing essentially evil. I would not say this. I think, if we turn our thought for a moment to the world’s exposition, now going on, on the other side of the Atlantic, and call to mind the recognition of great mechanical skill and great success, by giving diplomas, etc., we may see in it a good, and not an evil. For when we examine these things we discover that these men of enterprise have not been aiming at the prize, but at utility, at the practical ends of life before them. They have not been employing their skill in building up apparatus, for the sake of a prize; but, having achieved their work, they take it to the exposition, and, placing it alongside of other work, they take what is simply a

recognition of the fact, after the fact ; but which had no place in stimulating the inventive genius, by which the machine was produced. I see no objection to a prize thus bestowed. But does it not become a different thing, when you take a class and say, "There are Deacon So-and-So, and Esquire So-and-So, all through the community, who were graduates of such a school, and took the medal ; and I want you should aim at the medal." You lay the foundation for a motive and purpose which are fictitious and false, and create an ambitious desire for an extraneous reward, to the neglect of a love of study. I submit whether the use of such a motive is not the introduction of an obstacle to the growth of the mind ; whether it is not an obstacle, that should be put away.

At the same time, if the question were asked, whether, at the end of a protracted course of study, some prize, recognizing great attainment, may not properly be given, as a prize may be given to an inventor, I am not prepared to object. But it requires great wisdom to bestow it in a manner not to mar the motive and purpose for which it is bestowed.

In regard to the great subject of discipline which has been so ably discussed during the present session, as well as on former occasions, the question whether or not the rod may now be used, as in



the times of Solomon of old, I will not add any thing. I do not suppose I can add any wisdom to that to which you have already listened. But I will admit that I have not come to think that teachers should be advised never to use a harsh measure. It has always seemed to me there should be a reserved power somewhere; but where, I will not say. But whether we resort to force or not, if we adopt a style of discipline which induces fear and a state of unrest in the mind of the child, we have introduced something which will destroy that right-mindedness essential to intellectual improvement. Those who can govern a school by the gentler influences, by persuasion or by reason, and preserve a healthful bond of regard and affection for the teacher and a love of study, will have achieved the noblest success. Those who, failing in this, feel compelled to employ severer measures, but secure the same result, will also have achieved success. But those who fail to leave the child in such a state of mind, will have failed to cultivate right-mindedness. It is not so much a question of rod or no rod, as of the condition of mind after the chastisement has been employed.

Undoubtedly various means must be employed to cause authority to be recognized and respected; and the more perfectly authority can operate, through an unperverted understanding, the better. That order

must be maintained there is no question ; and he who fails to maintain it, without leaving the mind in a condition of restraint, fails to secure the condition most favorable to growth.

I might refer you to another field from the cultivation of which you are not exempt : I mean the field of morals. I hesitate somewhat, lest I may be thought to introduce a subject from which we are debarred. But I do not see how it can be entirely neglected. If you point a child to a duty, and say, "If you do not perform it, there is such a measure of punishment, and if you do perform it, there is such a measure of reward," you have introduced motives which are not purifying, the reception of which gives a twist to the mind and moral character, that may be most deleterious in its life-long influence. If there is any labor that will bear with it its own recompense, it is the labor of well-doing ; if there is any field of enterprise that can afford to be satisfied with its own harvests, it is the field of obedience to Christian commandments. If there is a single duty in the world that does not need bolstering by extraneous considerations, it is the duty to Almighty God by which one comes into a union with the source of all life. Now why should we turn away from the inherent joys of right-doing, as a motive ?

Let the motives we employ in the school-room be such as will improve the condition of the mind morally, as well as intellectually.

## LECTURE VII.

---

### TRUANCY: THE EVIL AND REMEDY.

BY REV. B. G. NORTHROP.

I PROPOSE to speak of TRUANCY: *the Evil, the Extent, the Cause, and the Remedy.*

The evils of truancy are so obvious and serious, that it would seem nothing need be said of its mischievous tendencies; and yet, were they duly appreciated, a remedy would everywhere be found and applied. No fact connected with our public schools has impressed me so sadly as the extent of non-attendance, and the strange apathy of the public as to this most fruitful source of juvenile crime. This crying evil calls loudly for a remedy. No State has done more in this direction than Massachusetts. Her truant laws are excellent. But are they executed? Do the people realize the wide prevalence of truancy, and its tendencies to the demoralization of our youth? The law plainly says, — “ Each city and town shall make all needful provisions and arrangements concerning habitual truants, and also

concerning children wandering about in the streets or public places of any city or town, having no lawful occupation or business, not attending school, and growing up in ignorance, between the ages of seven and sixteen years," etc., etc. But according to the last returns, two hundred and thirty-seven towns made no such provisions. Ninety-eight cities and towns only have appointed truant officers. In many of the cities, and in a few towns, these truant laws are faithfully executed, and with happy results; but I fear that in many, even of these ninety-eight towns, these provisions are disregarded, and the truant office is practically a sinecure.

The extent of truancy is admitted, but the greatness of the evil, as one of the most dangerous forms of incipient crime, is not duly felt. Truancy creates a distaste for study, a dislike of school, disregard for authority, impatience of restraint, and fosters self-will and self-indulgence, and forms habits of idleness and vagrancy. "Nothing to do," tempts to do every thing bad; for idleness is one of the parent vices. Three words, — truancy, the street school, and the penitentiary, — make up the history of many criminals. The truant not only ruins himself, but his companions. One example makes another. The evil spreads by a rapid contagion, and unless early checked, will become a wide-spread and desolating scourge to society. But save these juvenile delin-

quents, and you not only prevent a vast amount of moral contamination and crime, but turn those active natures into channels of usefulness and virtue.

*It is important to investigate the causes of this great evil.* They are many and various. The subject is full of difficulties. But we must search out the sources of the mischief, in order intelligently to apply the remedy.

Orphanage, poverty, neglect, discouragement, may often explain the absence of hope and ambition on the part of many unfortunate children. To them the prospect of self-improvement brings no bright visions of better days. They live from hand to mouth, content with the supply of their animal wants.

With another class, parental ignorance, indifference, intemperance, or vicious example in some other form, leads astray. Truancy is always a sign of bad home-training. How many youths receive no right parental influence, and have no home worthy of the name! The house where they only eat and sleep, is the scene of contention and profanity, fitted to drive away its inmates to the street school. Dissolute habits of parents, bringing rags and wretchedness into the home, turn the children as truants and beggars into the streets. These vagrants accustomed to break out when night overtakes them, soon lose

all pride of character, all self-respect, and even the sense of shame.

*Irregularity of attendance* tends directly to truancy. Frequent absence without good reason, is incipient vagrancy; destroying interest in study, and inducing aversion to school. Here, as everywhere, we must resist the *beginnings* of evil, and at once win the straying into the path of duty.

Expulsion from school is one cause of truancy. I have found boys expelled from school who seemed to me neither vicious nor incorrigible; whose offence originated in heedlessness, love of fun, restlessness, stupidity, or aversion to study, rather than sullenness and depravity; whom wiser influences might reclaim. Instead of operating as a reformatory measure, a *hasty* expulsion is more likely to awaken a sense of injury, and provoke a spirit of retaliation and recklessness. It involves that disgrace and loss of self-respect which weaken the restraints of virtue. Though sometimes necessary, it should be inflicted only in extreme cases as a *dernier resort*. It should not be adopted as a cheap riddance of trouble; a cowardly retreat from difficulties, which a courageous and earnest spirit would meet and master. The unpopularity of corporal punishments has recently multiplied cases of expulsion. I am informed, by judicious and experienced truant officers, that boys have often been too summa-



rily turned over to the penal rigors of the law, who, in their judgment, should be still retained in school, and upon whom the resources and expedients of kindness, persuasion, parental and a firm discipline, have not been duly tried. Not till all these expedients have failed should the truant law be enforced.

Another common cause is the illegal employment of children in manufacturing establishments. In most of the New-England and Middle States, they are required, by law, to attend school at least twelve weeks of each year's work in any manufactory. That law is openly disregarded. The class most indifferent to the education of their children of any which I have met, is the French Canadians; ignorant themselves, and willing their children should be like them, but most eager to press, at the tenderest age, into our factories, thus dwarfing the body as well as the mind. When, at length, dull times, or the enforcement of the law, sends large numbers out of employment, their long absence from school, often from two to five years, has stifled any love of learning they may ever have had; and a sense of backwardness and dread of school-tasks discourage all attempts at mental improvement. In one district within my knowledge, where the operatives are mostly French Canadians, two hundred and twenty-nine out of three hundred and eighty-nine, of school age, did not attend school.

In another district, inquiry brought to light many individual cases like these. In one factory were found two girls eleven years old, and one twelve years, not in school for two years; one fourteen years, not in school for five years; one eleven years, one fifteen, and one seventeen, each not in school for *four* years; one thirteen years, not in school for three years. All these were girls. In the same district were eleven boys, all of school age, who had been absent from school, on an average, over three years.

Besides the intemperate and vicious, to whom I have alluded, there are three classes of *parents* who keep their children from school.

1. Those who are, or who think they are, too poor to clothe their children decently.
2. Those who have little or no appreciation of the advantages of education, like the Chinese and Japanese, in California, and the French Canadians, in the Eastern States.
3. And those who are so greedy of gain, that they needlessly confine their children at mill-work as soon as they can earn the smallest wages, to the entire neglect of education.

None too soon has the law absolutely prohibited the employment of children under ten years of age in any manufacturing establishment, and extended the required time of school attendance from three

to six months for all under fourteen years of age, and made the parent or guardian equally liable to the penalty with the owner or agent.

Had it not come, often, under my own observation, it would seem to me impossible that any parents would be willing to thus impoverish their children's minds for the sake of enriching their purses. Said a Boston teacher, "Some parents keep their children from school because they want their services to procure chips, to beg, to steal; in fine, to get anything in any way." One of the truants sent to Deer Island a few days ago, gained five dollars a day for her intemperate parents by begging.

What is the remedy?

In reference to the first class named, where children are really destitute of comfortable clothing and parents are too poor to provide for them, their wants should enlist the sympathies of the benevolent. If teachers, and committees, and school superintendents, would seek out and report these cases, such wants might be easily supplied by individual charities. Indeed I have known this to be frequently and cheerfully done. Similar benevolence in many towns every year enables poor children to attend Sabbath schools. What numbers would be brought at once into the public school, if it everywhere enlisted the same active zeal which the Sabbath school has justly

called forth. While I entertain the highest estimate of the usefulness of the Sabbath school, I believe that the public school is vastly more important, accomplishing far more for morality, for all the virtues, and even for piety. In the one you influence the children but a single hour in the week, in the other, thirty. In the one the lessons are how often unlearned, and the child but a passive recipient; in the other, the teacher has authority, the lessons must be studied, the pupil comes under the wholesome restraint of *law*, and habits of order and obedience are formed.

The great end of the true teacher is to fix good impressions upon the heart, and make a healthful moral influence continually though unconsciously encircle the child, and permeate everything. In the public school not only are the pupils brought for a longer time under salutary influence, but, to a large number of our children, the common school furnishes the only means of moral as well as intellectual culture.

With the other classes of parents named, moral influence must be our chief reliance. Great results may be achieved by personal kindness and persuasion. Let both *teachers* and committees visit them, enlighten their minds, appeal to their love of children and parental pride, awaken their consciences as the divinely appointed guardians of their offspring, urge

upon their consideration the great importance of education to their children, turn their attention to the high privileges freely furnished them in the public schools, and by every persuasive show that it is their interest to avail themselves of these great advantages, and the effort will in most cases be successful. Let the same persuasive kindness follow the children themselves. Let them feel the evils of absence and the advantages of attendance, and the true relation of the school to their happiness, thrift, and prosperity through life ; and the appeal will not be made in vain. The teacher who will thus perseveringly seek to win the heart and reason of the straying, is the most effective truant officer. Kindness may conquer perverse natures, and gain lasting victories. The teacher has rare opportunities of reclaiming erring youth, and thus winning their lasting gratitude. Very much can be accomplished in this direction by frequent and friendly conferences with parents. It is my privilege to know not a few teachers, who in their untiring devotion to their duties, evince a genuine *missionary spirit*, and who, in addition to all the labors of the school-room, "go about doing good," to the neglected youth within their reach ; who personally report to parents every instance of truancy, or serious delinquency ; uniformly inquire into the causes of absence ; visit pupils in sickness ; and by manifold proofs of sympathy, win

the confidence and cordial co-operation of parents, even of those hitherto indifferent or captious I know such a teacher who in a few years stopped truancy where it had been most prevalent, and transformed the worst school in town into the best.

There are other teachers whose theory and practice limit their duties to school-hours, and relieve them of all that care and labor outside of the school-room which are needful to prevent truancy and absenteeism.

In the court room in this city, where the truants are tried, as I have to-day been informed, a dialogue not unfrequently occurs between the judge and the teacher, substantially in this language:—

*Judge.* Have you ever *visited* the parents of this boy?

*Teacher.* No, sir.

*Judge.* Have you ever sent a note to his parents, requesting either of them to call upon you at the school?

*Teacher.* No, sir.

*Judge.* Have you ever seen either of the parents?

*Teacher.* No, sir.

*Judge.* What evidence have you that he is a truant?

*Teacher.* Common rumor. The report of the other scholars.

In my judgment, it is the teacher's privilege and



duty to visit the parents of such offenders, learn the causes of their delinquency, and invite parental co-operation.

On this subject I do not merely theorize. I have tried the experiment with happy results, and can point to many instances of youth, thus rescued from the contamination of the street school, now regular pupils, or useful and virtuous citizens. How amply have these humble services been afterwards compensated by grateful acknowledgments, or by tears of joy, more eloquently bespeaking their cherished remembrance of timely aid and counsel. If teachers and committees will put themselves on the standpoint of children so as to appreciate their tendencies, wants, and even weaknesses, much good may be done by familiar conversation as to their plays, plans, habits, studies, and dangers. The most wayward child I have met, when properly approached, has kindly received friendly counsel and faithful warning, even as to his errors and offences. They may be desponding, with no pride of character, or desire of approbation, or even sense of shame, or respect for truth ; yes, false and profane ; and yet we must not give them up as hopeless cases, but, with faith in Christian incentives, strive to stir the conscience, quicken the moral nature, and win the affections.

Though unaccustomed to kindness, such boys are

not insensible to its influence. The tones of sympathy may touch a chord that will vibrate more sweetly because of its very strangeness.

If the people duly appreciated this great evil, and were in earnest to suppress it, not a truant could walk the streets, when known, without meeting such faithful warning, or kind persuasion, as to redeem him, if not among the rare incorrigibles. If the pulpit and the press would speak out in earnest tones, and the people in every city, town, and district, respond, this crying evil would pass away. Let each search for the truants in his own street, village, or district, to restrain by warning and counsel, or to encourage by clothing and money when in poverty. Let the school itself, with its music and gymnastics, its occasional pleasantries inside, and its freer plays at recess, be made so attractive, that attendance may be esteemed a privilege and a pleasure, and not an imprisonment, with its monotonous routine and drudgery. All genuine improvements, both in instruction and government, tend directly to lessen truancy.

But while kindness and moral suasion should be the main reliance in all efforts to prevent absenteeism or reclaim truants, it is of essential service to have some authority, some law, with its officers and sanctions to fall back upon. In those cases where parents without good reason deprive their children

of the advantage of education, or where they have no control, as in the case of an intemperate father or a widowed mother, legal coërcion may properly be employed. Better let a hyena rove at large, because his keeper cannot control him, than this class of hardened truants, who will go on from bad to worse; making others also thieves, robbers, and incendiaries.

The City of Springfield is now carrying out successful measures for the prevention of absenteeism and the reformation of truants, to which I may be permitted to refer, as the one with which I happen to be most familiar. It is this:—1. The teachers are specially and earnestly instructed to use all the means in their power to prevent truancy and to secure constant attendance, and to visit promptly the parents of every delinquent. 2. For such as they cannot control, an “ungraded school” is provided, to which all delinquents are first sent. Whenever any of these irregular pupils become uniformly constant in attendance, they are permitted to return to the graded school where they properly belong; but when their irregularity degenerates into truancy, as a third step they are sentenced by the police court to the reform school, a place of confinement at the city almshouse. They are here confined by themselves, entirely separate from the other inmates of the poor-house.

The aim of this school is reformation rather than

punishment. Its regulations are rather remedial than penal; its restraints are needed by those refractory natures. Parents unable to govern their children at home, have felt, painful as is the necessity, that it is better for them to be where they must learn subordination, and practise obedience under a system of discipline strict, though not severe. This reform school, with its earnest teacher, seems to me accomplishing a good work for its inmates; and besides this, according to the testimony of the teachers and the superintendent, it has exerted a most salutary influence outside in diminishing absenteeism and truancy, and greatly increasing the average attendance at school, which during the last year has risen from sixty-seven to eighty-seven per cent., showing the remarkable increase of twenty per cent.

Other causes, especially the marked improvement of the schools and school-houses, since the appointment of the efficient superintendent, have contributed to this striking result; but the most prominent agency is the new system for the reformation of truants. If now manual labor could be introduced into this school, alternating work and play, the Springfield plan would be well nigh perfect. The cost to the city, compared with the gain, is trifling. A kindred plan has been adopted in some other cities, and might well be employed in all, at moderate expense. The practice of sending truants to the common jail ought everywhere to be abandoned. It is not a

place of reformation. Its bad companionship makes it a school of evil.

What, then, shall be done with truants? is still the question I often hear. The State Reform Schools are full. The School Ships are crowded. These misguided boys should be separated from older and more open offenders, and placed where manual and mental labor can be combined. The cities can easily make such provisions for the instruction and employment as well as restraint and discipline of truants. But the small towns separately cannot do this. Let them combine. I heartily indorse the recommendation of my friend, the Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, that the duty of making all needful provisions for the confinement and instruction of truants in each county be transferred to the County Commissioners. In most cases this could be done by a slight enlargement of some city or town establishment already existing.

Still, I say, important as is the law, and essential as is the reform school, useful as have been our truant officers, earnest individual efforts on the part of teachers and friends of the young, will effect far more than any and all laws can do; while the existence of wise laws, and the appointment of faithful truant officers, will add weight and authority to all personal persuasions.

## LECTURE VIII.

---

THE PROPORTION IN WHICH KNOWLEDGE  
AND DISCIPLINE SHOULD BE MADE THE  
ENDS OF EDUCATION.

BY THOMAS HILL, LL.D.

THE proportion in which knowledge and discipline should be made ends in education, is one of those indefinite subjects upon which there may be an indefinite number of opinions, each equally just and true.

Some pupils require different instruction from others, owing to difference of disposition and ability; and some pupils are preparing for a different society and different state of life from others; some teachers also, are capable of imparting one kind of life, and stimulating to one kind of exertion, while others are fitted for a different labor.

The subject proposed for discussion may seem, then, at first sight, too indefinite for any profitable discussion at all. Yet, I think, we shall find, on



examination, that a discussion may reveal certain great principles applicable to the question, of intense practical interest, and of vital importance.

The two ends in education, so far as regards the intellect, may be thus stated: On the one hand, education is designed to train the mind to skill and wisdom of method, and to form the habit of continued application; on the other hand, it is designed to lead the student to a knowledge of truth, to inform him of the discoveries already made, to bring him upon the 'vantage ground of the knowledge of the nineteenth century.

These two ends of education, knowledge and discipline, are too often considered as antagonistic, and one or the other is made of undue importance, according to the philosophy and temper of the teacher. "It makes little difference," said a very intelligent teacher to me but a few weeks since, "*what* a young man studies, only provided he studies *something*." This speech betrays its origin; you might know that it came from a teacher of metaphysics. On the other hand, there are undoubtedly Gradgrinds in our profession who think nothing valuable but facts, and would almost reduce the labor of the student to that of committing facts to memory. It is too plain, however, to require proof, that it does make a great difference what a young man studies; whether, for example, in mathematics,

he endeavors to square the circle, or reverently tries to follow the sublime steps of Apollonius and Descartes and Leibnitz; whether, in mechanics, he searches after perpetual motion, or follows with Newton and Lagrange, the motions of the planets; and not to run through the encyclopædia of sciences, — it makes a great difference whether a young man of metaphysical talent spends his days over the subtleties of inferior men, or goes to the great thinkers of all ages for his counsellors. Nor does it need any argument to show that the mere accumulation of knowledge in a man's memory, without any wisdom or skill to use it, is of no value to him. That intellectual education is, beyond controversy, most valuable, which gives to the student the largest stores of learning that the young man can acquire, with the greatest possible readiness to bring them into use most skillfully and effectively to serve his ends. Happy for him and for men also, if his ends are good, and his will trained to persistent struggles to attain the good.

In the order of nature it seems evident that we must at first have a somewhat untrained growth; training comes afterwards. This holds for the intellect as for other parts of our system. During the first years of childhood, facts are presented by nature, in innumerable multitude and in inextricable confusion. The first step in education should be to

present simply the facts, arranged in logical order, adding to those which are visible to sense, those which have been discovered by the human mind. Simply the facts are to be given, at first, in the most naked way. Then the facts are to be clothed by imagination, and presented as grouped under laws and other artifices of the intellect, by which it strives, often unconsciously, to enter into communion with the Divine thought. Then, as the third step, comes reasoning; and the pupil is taught to connect truth with truth, by the analysis of the necessary operations of thought. The proportion in which knowledge and discipline are to be made ends in intellectual education, varies, then, with the age of the pupil. The youngest children are to be disciplined only so far as their power of mere perception and memory are concerned; and the great care of *their* instructors is, neither to stimulate them to overwork, nor to require too much of them, but to give them facts, visible objects, and concrete statements, to be comprehended and remembered. The pupil, in the last years of his schooling, on the other hand, is to be chiefly occupied in a careful series of exercises in which his own powers are brought into play; writing original solutions of problems, original essays, original arguments, etc.

In the best education the student will be at every step disciplined or exercised, as much as his power

will admit, without producing weariness or other tokens of overwork. But this exercise will be sought, not in mental fox-hunts, but in the pursuit of that which rewards the successful aspirant more than the gold of California,—in the pursuit of truth, of truth worth having for its own sake, useful truth. Not until we find it impossible to attain sufficient discipline in learning old, and seeking new, *useful truths*, are we justified in setting the pupil at any mere gymnastic of the mind. Let us be careful, however, in our judgment of what is useful. The veriest nonsense and trifling is useful, when it is rest to a weary man; recreation is as necessary as original creation. And whatever is true, in any high and dignified sense of the word, is also useful. Whatever truth gives a better knowledge of yourself, and enables you more readily to maintain your own purity and health and strength and integrity, is useful. Whatever truth gives you a better knowledge of nature, and enables you to avail yourself more intelligently and profitably of her gratuitous services, ever offered to you and to all men, is useful. Whatever truth brings you to a better knowledge of other men, and a quicker sympathy with them, so that you can do more for your family and your neighborhood, your country and mankind, is useful. Whatever truth brings you to a fuller recognition of the Divine Thought, expressed through whatever medium, and

makes you a more intelligent and willing worshipper and servant of God, whose service is perfect freedom and joy, is useful. The useful is that which contributes to human wealth; and wealth is the sum of all that contributes to human weal, to human well-being and happiness. What can be more useful, then, than that knowledge of abstract truths which gives man the highest conceivable happiness, the happiness of feeling that he is permitted to think the very thoughts of the All-knowing and All-good?

And in the pursuit of such useful truths as these; in seeking to comprehend those great principles which govern the universe, which are the incarnation of the Divine thoughts, the knowledge of which is power, to benefit mankind, and to elevate oneself; in the earnest seeking after the highest principles (the most compacted as well as the most extensive knowledge), man will ever find the fittest discipline for his powers. The Infinite Teacher has made no error in the text-books which he has spread before us.